EMANUEL TOV

Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
121

Mohr Siebeck

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum

Edited by

Peter Schäfer (Princeton, NJ)
Annette Y. Reed (Philadelphia, PA)
Seth Schwartz (New York, NY)
Azzan Yadin (New Brunswick, NJ)

121

Emanuel Tov

Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran

Collected Essays

Mohr Siebeck

Emanuel Tov, born 1941; 1973 Ph. D. in biblical studies at the Hebrew University; since 1986 professor in the Department of Bible of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem; since 1990 he holds the J. L. Magnes chair.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151454-8
ISBN 978-3-16-149546-5
ISSN 0721-8753 (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de.*

© 2008 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen using Minion typeface, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Dedicated to our granddaughters
Eden and Maya, Adi and Noa

Preface

The studies included in this volume form a collection of revised and updated papers published between the years 1990–2008. They focus on the textual criticism of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles and the Dead Sea Scrolls. They also provide a good introduction to modern trends of thinking on the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and their importance for the textual and literary analysis of the Bible. Not included in this collection are thirty-two studies on scribal practices that were combined and updated in my monograph *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004). By the same token, this collection does not contain text editions or other studies included in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series.

This volume follows an earlier compilation of my *Kleine Schriften* (1971–1997) published as *The Greek and Hebrew Bible – Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1999; unchanged paperback edition: Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).

Subdivided into three segments (Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran), this updated and revised collection of essays represents research of the past seventeen years. The collection focuses on various aspects of the textual analysis of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles, as well as the Qumran biblical manuscripts in Hebrew and Greek. In these studies, I take a special interest in the orthography of biblical manuscripts, the nature of the early Masoretic Text, the nature of the Qumran biblical texts and their importance for our understanding of the history of the biblical text, the editions of the Hebrew Bible, and the use of computers in biblical studies. My work also focuses on the interaction between textual and literary criticism, and the question of the original text or texts of the Hebrew Bible. Areas of special interest in the Qumran scrolls include the nature of the Qumran corpus, their scribal background, the contents of the various Qumran caves, and the number of compositions and copies found at Qumran. In the Septuagint studies included in this volume, my interest revolves around the translation's text-critical value, the Greek texts from the Judean Desert, and its translation technique.

As far as was possible, an ever-increasing stream of new studies were taken into consideration in the analysis in these studies, and the bibliography was updated. Ten or fifteen years is a long period in the fields dealt with in these studies.

For most studies appearing in this volume, I was able to use the computer versions of the earlier papers as a basis for the updating. A few studies needed to be adapted from a PC version to my Macintosh environment or were typed in afresh. Further, my hand-written notes needed to be inserted as well, and the studies needed to be adapted to a unified editorial system. I gratefully acknowledge the help of my daughter Ophirah at an initial stage and of Janice Karnis for the bulk of this work. Janice also helped me in compiling the indexes. Her careful eye and feeling for style once again came to my aid. I further enlisted the help of Benjamin Parker of Trinity Western University in Langley, Canada, who wrote macro procedures for the Macintosh index files.

The initiative for the publication of this book goes back to the many conversations I held with Prof. M. Hengel of Tübingen about topics of common interest, and I owe it to him that this volume is published with Mohr Siebeck. Subsequent conversations with Dr. Georg Siebeck consolidated the connection. Dr. Henning Ziebritzki guided me through the preparation stages of the manuscript. The difficult electronic adaptation of my Macintosh files to a PC environment was very ably performed by Mr. M. Spitzner and the typesetter Mr. M. Fischer. I am very grateful to all these gentlemen.

This book is dedicated to our four granddaughters Eden and Maya, Adi and Noa.

Jerusalem, 1 February 2008 Emanuel Tov

Contents

Preface VII
Sources XII
Editions of Textual Sources XVI
Periodicals, Reference Works, and Serials XVII
Bibliographical Abbreviations XX
Other Abbreviations XXXII

A. Hebrew Bible

1. Review of J. Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* 3

2. Deuteronomy 12 and 11QTemple[a] LII–LIII:
A Contrastive Analysis 17

3. 4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of Its Contents 21

4. Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran 27

5. The Text of Isaiah at Qumran 42

6. Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts,
with Special Attention Paid to the Samaritan Pentateuch 57

7. The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada 71

8. The Textual Basis of Modern Translations of the Hebrew Bible 92

9. The Copying of a Biblical Scroll 107

10. The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert – An Overview
and Analysis 128

11. The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX
and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources ... 155

12. The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues 171

13. The *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* – An Important Step Forward 189

14. The *Ketiv/Qere* Variations in Light of the Manuscripts from the Judean Desert 199

15. The Writing of Early Scrolls: Implications for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture 206

16. Recording the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Text Editions of Hebrew Scripture 221

17. The Use of Computers in Biblical Research 228

18. Hebrew Scripture Editions: Philosophy and Praxis 247

19. Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy 271

20. Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere 283

B. Greek Bible

21. Introductory Essay to the Second Edition of the Hatch-Redpath *Concordance to the Septuagint*
In conjunction with R. A. Kraft 309

22. Approaches towards Scripture Embraced by the Ancient Greek Translators 325

23. The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert 339

24. The Evaluation of the Greek Scripture Translations in Rabbinic Sources 365

25. Biliteral Exegesis of Hebrew Roots in the Septuagint? 378

26. The Septuagint and the Deuteronomists 398

C. Qumran

27. The Special Character of the Texts Found in Qumran Cave 11 421

28. The Number of Manuscripts and Compositions Found at Qumran ... 428

Index of Ancient Sources 439
Index of Authors 452

Sources

1. Review of: J. Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1986*, *JSS* 35 (1990) 303–16.
2. "*Deut*eronomy 12 and *11QTemple*[a] LII–LIII: A Contrastive Analysis," *RevQ* 15 (1991) 169–73.
3. "4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of Its Contents," *RevQ* 16 (1995) 647–53.
4. "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1995) 581–600.
5. "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," in *Writing & Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. C. C. Broyles and C. A. Evans; VTSup 70, 1–2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997) II.491–511.
6. "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," *DSD* 5 (1998) 334–54.
7. "The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, May 12–14 1996* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; *STDJ* 28; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1998) 233–56.
8. "The Textual Basis of Modern Translations of the Hebrew Bible: The Argument against Eclecticism," *Textus* 20 (2000) 193–211.
9. "The Copying of a Biblical Scroll," *JRH* 26 (2002) 189–209.
10. "The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert – An Overview and Analysis," in *The Bible as Book – The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library & Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002) 139–66.
11. "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible. The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuaginta Reconsidered* (ed. A. Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003) 121–44.
12. "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in *The Ancient Synagogue: From Its Origins until 200 C. E. – Papers*

Presented at an International Conference at Lund University October 14–17, 2001 (ed. B. Olsson and M. Zetterholm; ConBNT 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003) 237–59.

13. "The *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* – An Important Step Forward," *JNSL* 31 (2005) 1–21.
14. "The *Ketiv/Qere* Variations in Light of the Manuscripts from the Judean Desert," in *Text, Theology & Translation, Essays in Honour of Jan de Waard* (ed. S. Crisp and M. Jinbachian; United Bible Societies, 2004) 199–207.
15. "The Writing of Early Scrolls. Implications for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture," in *l'Écrit et l'Esprit. Études d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (ed. D. Böhler et al.; OBO 214; Fribourg: Academic Press/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2005) 355–71.
16. "Recording the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Text Editions of Hebrew Scripture," in *Historie og konstruktion, Festskrift til Niels Peter Lemche I anledning af 60 års fødselsdagen den 6, September 2005* (ed. M. Müller and Th. L. Thompson; FBE 14; Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanums Forlag, Københavns Universitet, 2005) 387–95.
17. "The Use of Computers in Biblical Research," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. P. W. Flint et al.; VTSup 101; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006) 337–59.
18. "Hebrew Scripture Editions: Philosophy and Praxis," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection–Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; *STDJ* 61; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2006) 281–312.
19. "Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy," in *Studies in Deuteronomy and Ancient Israelite Religion Presented to Jeffrey H. Tigay* (ed. N. Fox et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2008), forthcoming.
20. "Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere," in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 369–93.
21. *With R. A. Kraft*: "Introductory Essay," to: E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1998) xi–xix.
22. "Approaches towards Scripture Embraced by the Ancient Greek Translators," in *Der Mensch vor Gott – Forschungen zum Menschenbild in Bibel, antikem Judentum und Koran. Festschrift für Herrmann Lichtenberger zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. U. Mittmann-Richert et al.; Neukirchener: Neukirchen, 2003) 213–28.
23. "The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert," in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (ed. S. McKendrick and O. A. O'Sullivan;

London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2003) 97–122.

24. "The Evaluation of the Greek Scripture Translations in Rabbinic Sources," in *Interpreting Translation. Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne; BETL CXCII; Leuven/Paris/Dudley, Mass.: University Press/Peeters, 2005) 385–99.
25. "Biliteral Exegesis of Hebrew Roots in the Septuagint?" in *Reflection and Refraction. Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. R. Rezetko et al.; VTSup 113; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2006) 459–82.
26. "The Septuagint and the Deuteronomists," *Textus* 23 (2007) 151–79 (© 2007 The Hebrew University Magnes Press, Jerusalem).
27. "The Special Character of the Texts Found in Qumran Cave 11," in *Things Revealed. Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (ed. E. G. Chazon et al.; JSJSup 89; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004) 187–96.
28. "The Number of Manuscripts and Compositions Found at Qumran," in *Feasts and Fasts, A Festschrift in Honour of Alan David Crown* (ed. M. Dacy et al.; Mandelbaum Studies in Judaica 11; Sydney: University of Sydney, 2005) 67–79.

Editions of Textual Sources

LXX	The individual volumes in the Göttingen Septuagint series, when extant; otherwise the text of LXX is quoted from the edition of Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*.
$LXX^{MS(S)}$	The individual volumes in the Göttingen Septuagint series, when extant; otherwise the text of the manuscript(s) is quoted from the editions of the Cambridge series.
LXX^{Luc}	The Lucianic tradition (mainly manuscripts b,o,c_2,e_2 according to the sigla used in the Cambridge Septuagint) of the LXX, quoted according to the Göttingen and Cambridge editions.
MT	*BHS*
S	The Leiden edition of the Peshitta, when extant: *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the* Peshiḥta *Version* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966–). Otherwise the edition of Lee (London 1823) is quoted.
SP	Tal, *Samaritan Pentateuch,*
T^{O}	A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts,* vols. I–IVa (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959–1968).
V	R. Weber, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1975).

Periodicals, Reference Works, and Serials

AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AHAW	Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften
AJSL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*
ALBO	Analecta lovaniensia biblica et orientalia
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
APSP	*American Philosophical Society Proceedings*
ArBib	The Aramaic Bible
ArOr	*Archiv Orientální*
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
ASTI	*Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute*
ATA	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
Atiqot	*ʿAtiqot*
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	*Biblica*
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BWA(N)T	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CATSS	Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies
CB	Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series*
ConBNT	Coniectanea neotestamentica/Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
DB	*Dictionnaire de la Bible*
DBSup	*Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément*

DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EncBib	*Encyclopaedia Biblica* (Heb.)
EncBrit	*Encyclopaedia Britannica*
EncJud	*Encyclopaedia Judaica*
ErIsr	*Eretz Israel*
EstBib	*Estudios bíblicos*
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
FBE	Forum for Bibelsk Eksegese
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
Hen	*Henoch*
HeyJ	*Heythrop Journal*
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
HUB	*Hebrew University Bible*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
IDBSup	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume*
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
IOSCS	International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JRH	*Journal of Religious History*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KEH	Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Leipzig 1838–)
LUÅ	Lunds universitets årsskrift
McCQ	*McCormick Quarterly*
MdB	*Le Monde de la Bible*
MGWJ	*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
Muséon	*Muséon: Revue d'études orientales*
NAWG	*Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*
NJPST	New JPS translation (see bibliography)
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis

OLA	Orientalia lovaniensia
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*
PAAJR	*Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research*
PG	Patrologia graeca
RB	*Revue biblique*
REg	*Revue d'égyptologie*
REJ	*Revue des études juives*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RQ	*Romische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte*
RSO	*Revista degli studi orientali*
Salm	*Salmanticensis*
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations
SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMasS	Society of Biblical Literature Masoretic Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
ScrHier	Scripta hierosolymitana
SE	*Studia evangelica*
SEÅ	*Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*
Sem	*Semitica*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Studies Monograph Series
STDJ	*Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*
STK	*Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift*
SubBi	*Subsidia biblica*
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau*
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*
TS	Texts and Studies
TS, NS	Texts and Studies, New Series
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
TvT	*Tijdschrift voor theologie*
TynBul	*Tyndale Bulletin*
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

Bibliographical Abbreviations

Albertz, *Daniel*
: R. Albertz, *Der Gott des Daniel, Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4–6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches* (SBS 131; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988)

Barr, *Comparative Philology*
: J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986; repr. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987)

–, *Literalism*
: J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (NAWG I, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1979, 11 = MSU XV; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 279–325

Barthélemy, *Devanciers*
: D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VTSup 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963)

–, *Critique textuelle*
: –, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament,* 1–3 (OBO 50/1–3; Fribourg/ Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982–1992)

–, "L'enchevêtrement"
: –, "L'enchevêtrement de l'histoire textuelle et de l'histoire littéraire dans les relations entre la Septante et le Texte Massorétique – Modifications dans la manière de concevoir les relations existant entre la LXX et le TM, depuis J. Morin jusqu'à E. Tov," in Pietersma–Cox, *De Septuaginta*, 21–40

BDB
: S. R. Driver, F. Brown, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957)

Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*
: R. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1985)

BH
: *Biblia Hebraica* (1st and 2d eds.: ed. R. Kittel, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1905, 1913; 3d ed.: ed. R. Kittel and P. Kahle, 1929–1937; 3d [7th] ed.: ed. R. Kittel, P. Kahle, A. Alt, and O. Eissfeldt, 1951; all Stuttgart: Württembürgische Bibelanstalt)

BHQ
: *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (ed. A. Schenker et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004–), *Part 18: General Introduction and Megilloth* (ed. P. B. Dirksen et al.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004); *Part 20: Ezra and Nehemiah* (ed. D. Marcus; Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006)

BHS
: *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (ed. W. Rudolph and K. Elliger; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967–1977; last printing to date: 1997)

Bible grecque
M. Harl, G. Dorival, and O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante – Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Paris: Cerf, 1988)

Biblia Qumranica
Biblia Qumranica, Vol. 3B Minor Prophets (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and K. De Troyer; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004)

Bickerman, *"Septuagint"*
E. Bickerman, "The Septuagint as a Translation," *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* 1 (AGJU 9; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976) 167–200 (published first in *PAAJR* 28 [1959] 1–39)

–, "Notes"
–, "Notes on the Greek Book of Esther," *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* 1 (AGJU 9; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976) 246–74

Blau, *Studien*
L. Blau, *Studien zum althebräischen Buchwesen und zur biblischen Literatur- und Textgeschichte* (Strasbourg i. E.: Adolf Alkalay, 1902)

Border Line
On the Border Line – Textual Meets Literary Criticism – Proceedings of a Conference in Honor of Alexander Rofé on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday (Heb.; ed. Z. Talshir and D. Amara; Beer Sheva XVIII; Beer Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2005)

Brock, "Phenomenon"
S. P. Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," *OTS* 17 (1972) 11–36

–, "Aspects"
–, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *GRBS* 20 (1979) 69–87

Brooke–García Martínez, *New Qumran Texts*
New Qumran Texts and Studies – Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992 (ed. G. J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ XV, Leiden/New York/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1994)

Burrows, *Isaiah*
M. Burrows with the assistance of J. C. Trever and W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, I, The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven, Conn.: ASOR, 1950)

chapter*
References with a star (e. g. chapter 1*) refer to chapters in this book.

Cohen, *Miqra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer'*
M. Cohen, *Miqra'ot Gedolot 'Haketer' – A Revised and Augmented Scientific Edition of Miqra'ot Gedolot Based on the Aleppo Codex and Early Medieval MSS,* parts 1–7 (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1992–2000)

Cotton–Geiger, *Masada II*
H. M. Cotton and J. Geiger, *Masada II, The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports, The Latin and Greek Documents* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989)

Cox, *VI Congress*
VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986 (ed. C. E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987)

–, *VII Congress*
VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989 (ed. C. E. Cox; SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991)

Cross, *ALQ*[3]
F. M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3d ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995)
Dimant, "*Apocryphon*"
D. Dimant, "*The Apocryphon of Joshua* – 4Q522 9 ii: A Reappraisal," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 179–204
DJD I
D. Barthélemy, O. P. and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955)
DJD II
P. Benoit, O. P., J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba'ât* (DJD II; Oxford: Clarendon, 1961)
DJD III
M. Baillet et al., *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962)
DJD IV
J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs[a])* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965)
DJD V
J. M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968)
DJD VI
R. de Vaux and J. T. Milik, *Qumrân grotte 4.II: I. Archéologie, II. Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128–4Q157)* (DJD VI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1977)
DJD VII
M. Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982)
DJD VIII
E. Tov with the collaboration of R. A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr) (The Seiyal Collection I)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990)
DJD IX
P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992)
DJD X
E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Ma'asé ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)
DJD XI
E. Eshel et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
DJD XII
Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers (ed. E. Ulrich and F. M. Cross; DJD XII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)
DJD XIII
H. Attridge et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)
DJD XIV
Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings (ed. E. Ulrich and F. M. Cross; DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995)
DJD XV
E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (DJD XV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)

DJD XVI
E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD XVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000)
DJD XVII
F. M. Cross, D. Parry, and E. Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005)
DJD XVIII
J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996)
DJD XIX
M. Broshi et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995)
DJD XX
T. Elgvin et al., in consultation with J. A. Fitzmyer, S. J. , *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (DJD XX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)
DJD XXI
S. Talmon, J. Ben Dov, and U. Glessmer, *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts* (DJD XXI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
DJD XXII
G. Brooke et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996)
DJD XXIII
F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–30* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
DJD XXIV
M. J. W. Leith, *Wadi Daliyeh Seal Impressions* (DJD XXIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)
DJD XXV
É. Puech, *Qumran Cave 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
DJD XXVI
P. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yaḥad and Two Related Texts* (DJD XXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
DJD XXVII
H. M. Cotton and A. Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Documentary Texts from Naḥal Ḥever and Other Sites, with an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts (The Seiyâl Collection II)* (DJD XXVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)
DJD XXVIII
D. M. Gropp, *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh*; E. Schuller et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* (DJD XXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
DJD XXIX
E. Chazon et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999)
DJD XXX
D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)

DJD XXXI
É. Puech, *Qumran Cave 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549* (DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
DJD XXXIII
D. Pike and A. Skinner, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIII: Unidentified Fragments* (DJD XXXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
DJD XXXIV
J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, S. J., and T. Elgvin, in consultation with J. A. Fitzmyer, S. J., *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: 4QInstruction (Mûsār le Mēvîn): 4Q415ff.* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999)
DJD XXXV
J. Baumgarten et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts* (DJD XXXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999)
DJD XXXVI
S. J. Pfann, *Cryptic Texts*; P. Alexander et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Miscellanea*, *Part 1* (DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000)
DJD XXXVIII
J. Charlesworth et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert* (DJD XXXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000)
DJD XXXIX
E. Tov et al., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert *Series* (DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002)
Dogniez, *Bibliography*
C. Dogniez, *Bibliography of the Septuagint = Bibliographie de la Septante 1970–1993* (VTSup 60; Leiden/New York: E. J. Brill, 1995)
DSS After Fifty Years
The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment, vols. 1–2 (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1998, 1999)
Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible
The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered (ed. A. Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2003)
Encyclopedia DSS
Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000)
Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*
P. W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997)
Fraenkel, *Studien zur Septuaginta*
Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren (ed. D. Fraenkel et al., MSU XX; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)
Frankel, *Vorstudien*
Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1841; repr., Westmead: Gregg, 1972)
–, *Einfluss*
–, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: J. A. Barth, 1851)

García Martínez–Parry, *Bibliography*
F. García Martínez and D. W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970–95* (STDJ 19; Leiden/New York/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1996)
Gesenius–Kautzsch, *Grammar*
E. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1910)
Ginsburg, *Introduction*
C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897; repr. New York: Ktav, 1966)
Gooding, "Text and Midrash"
D. W. Gooding, "Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns," *Textus* 7 (1969) 1–29
–, *Relics*
–, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis, A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2* (SOTSMS 4; Cambridge: University Press, 1976)
Gordis, *Biblical Text*
R. Gordis, *The Biblical Text in the Making – A Study of the Kethib–Qere* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1937; repr. New York: Ktav, 1971)
Greenspoon–Munnich, *VIII Congress*
VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992 (ed. L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich; SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995)
Hendel, *Genesis*
R. S. Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1–11 – Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
HOTTP
D. Barthélemy et al., *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project,* vols. 1–5 (2d rev. ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1979–1980);
HR
E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, I–III (Oxford: Clarendon, 1892–1906; repr. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954; 2d ed.: Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1998 [with a Hebrew/Aramaic Index by T. Muraoka])
HUB–Isaiah
M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Isaiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995)
Jellicoe, *SMS*
S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968)
Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*
P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (2d ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1959)
van Keulen, *Two Versions*
P. S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11* (VTSup 104; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2005)
Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*
Septuagintal Lexicography (ed. R. A. Kraft; SBLSCS 1; Missoula, Mont.: SBL, 1972)
Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*
S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie,* III (Leipzig: Gustav Fock, 1912; repr. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966)

Kutscher, *Language*
Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIs[a])* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974)
Leaney, "Greek Manuscripts"
R. C. Leaney, "Greek Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert," in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text. Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. J. K. Elliott; NovTSup 44; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976) 283–300
Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue*
L. I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000)
Lieberman, *Hellenism*
S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (2d ed.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962)
LSJ
H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1940); LSJ is used together with LSJ, *Supplement* and P. G. W. Glare, *Revised Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996)
LSJ, *Supplement*
E. A. Barber, *A Greek-English Lexicon, A Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968)
Lust, *Ezekiel*
Ezekiel and his Book, Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986)
Manchester Symposium
Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, Manchester, 1990 (ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992)
Martin, *Scribal Character*
M. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vols. I–II (Bibliothèque du Muséon 44; Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1958)
Masada III
E. Netzer, *Masada III, The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports, The Buildings – Stratigraphy and Architecture* (Jerusalem: IES, 1991)
Masada VI
S. Talmon and Y. Yadin, *Masada VI, The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports, Hebrew Fragments from Masada* (Jerusalem: IES, 1999)
Metso–Ulrich, "Leviticus"
S. Metso and E. Ulrich, "The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus," in *The Book of Leviticus, Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2003) 248–68
Mikra
Mikra, Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section Two, I (ed. M. J. Mulder; Assen-Maastricht: Van Gorcum, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988)
Milik, *Enoch*
J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976)

Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*
C. A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1977)
NAB
The New American Bible (New York/London: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1970)
NEB
The New English Bible with the Apocrypha (Oxford/Cambridge: Oxford University Press/Cambridge University Press, 1970)
NJPST
Tanakh תנ"ך. *A New Translation of THE HOLY SCRIPTURES According to the Traditional Hebrew Text* (Philadelphia/New York/Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1985)
NRSV
The Holy Bible Containing the Old and New Testaments with the Apocryphal/ Deuterocanonical Books, New Revised Standard Version (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989)
Of Scribes and Scrolls
Of Scribes and Scrolls, Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell (ed. H. W. Attridge; College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1990)
Parry-Qimron, *Isaiah*
D. W. Parry and E. Qimron, *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa[a]): A New Edition* (STDJ 32; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1999)
Paul, *Emanuel*
Emanuel, Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov (ed. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman, and W. W. Fields, with the assistance of E. Ben-David; VTSup 94; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2003)
Pietersma–Cox, *De Septuaginta*
De Septuaginta, Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday (ed. A. Pietersma and C. E. Cox; Mississauga, Ont.: Benben, 1984)
Prijs, *Tradition*
L. Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948)
Puech, "Pierre de Sion"
É. Puech, "La pierre de Sion et l'autel des holocaustes d'après un manuscrit hébreu de la grotte 4 (4Q522)," *RB* 99 (1992) 676–96
Qimron, "Joshua Cycles"
E. Qimron, "Concerning 'Joshua Cycles' from Qumran," *Tarbiz* 63 (1995) 503–8 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).
Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*
A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935)
REB
The Revised English Bible with the Apocrypha (Oxford/Cambridge: Oxford University Press/Cambridge University Press, 1989)
Renewed Covenant
The Community of the Renewed Covenant, The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994)

RSV
The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, Revised Standard Version (London/Glasgow: Collins, 1952)
Sadaqa, *Jewish and Samaritan Version*
A. and R. Sadaqa, *Jewish and Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch – With Particular Stress on the Differences between Both Texts* (Tel Aviv: 1961–1965)
Schenker, *Septante*
A. Schenker, *Septante et texte Massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (CahRB 48; Paris 2000)
Scribal Practices, see: Tov, *Scribal Practices*
Schiffman, *Dead Sea Scrolls*
The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997 (ed. L. H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and The Shrine of the Book, 2000)
Skehan, "Qumran Manuscripts"
P. W. Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," VTSup 4 (1957) 148–60
–, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran"
–, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran, A. Textes bibliques," *DBSup,* vol. IX (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1979) 805–22
Sperber, *Historical Grammar*
A. Sperber, *A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew – A Presentation of Problems with Suggestions to Their Solution* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966)
Stegemann, "Weitere Stücke"
H. Stegemann, "Weitere Stücke von 4QpPsalm 37, von 4QPatriarchal Blessings und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium," *RevQ* 6 (1967) 193–227
–, *Library*
–, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge and Leiden/New York/Cologne: Eerdmans/ E. J. Brill, 1998)
Steudel, *Der Midrasch*
A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat$^{a.b}$)* (STDJ 13; Leiden/New York/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1994)
Sukenik, *'wsr hmgylwt hgnwzwt*
E. L. Sukenik, *'wsr hmgylwt hgnwzwt shbydy h'wnybrsyṭh h'bryt* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute and the Hebrew University, 1954)
Swete, *Introduction*
H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 1914)
Tal*, Samaritan Pentateuch*
A. Tal, *The Samaritan Pentateuch, Edited According to MS 6 (C) of the Shekhem Synagogue* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 8; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1994)
Talshir, *"Image"*
Z. Talshir, "The Image of the Septuagint Edition of the Book of Kings," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990) 249–302 (Heb. with English abstract).
Talmon*, World of Qumran*
S. Talmon, *The World of Qumran from Within* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989)

Taylor, *X Congress*
X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998 (ed. B. A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2001)
TCHB
see Tov, *TCHB*
TCU
see Tov, *TCU*
Thackeray, *Grammar*
H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: University Press, 1909)
–, *Septuagint*
–, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Schweich Lectures 1920; London: Milford, 1921)
The Bible as Book
The Bible as Book: Scriptures at Qumran, The Proceedings of the Conference on the Scriptures at Qumran, Hampton Court, Herefordshire, 18–21 June 2000 (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library, 2001)
Tigay, *Empirical Models*
Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism (ed. J. H. Tigay; Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1985)
Tov, "Methodology"
E. Tov, "The Methodology of Textual Criticism in Jewish Greek Scriptures, with Special Attention to the Problems in Samuel–Kings: The State of the Question: Problems and Proposed Solutions" in *1972 Proceedings, IOSCS* (ed. R. A. Kraft; SBLSCS 2; Missoula, Mont.: SBL, 1972) 3–15. Revised edition: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 489–99
–, *Jeremiah and Baruch*
–, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch – A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976)
–, "Midrash-Type Exegesis"
–, "Midrash-Type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua," *RB* 85 (1978) 50–61. Revised edition: *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 153–63
–, "Pentateuch"
–, "The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books," in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy* (ed. P. Casetti, O. Keel and A. Schenker; OBO 38; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 577–92. Revised edition: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 183–94
–, "The 'Lucianic' Text"
–, "The 'Lucianic' Text of the Canonical and the Apocryphal Sections of Esther: A Rewritten Biblical Book," *Textus* 10 (1982) 1–25. Revised edition: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 535–48
–, "Septuagint Translators"
–, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" in *De Septuaginta, Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox; Mississauga, Ont.: Benben Press, 1984) 53–70. Revised edition: *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 203–18
–, "Rabbinic Tradition"

–, "The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and Their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX," *JSJ* 15 (1984) 65–89. Revised edition: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 1–18

–, "LXX Additions."

–, "The LXX Additions (Miscellanies) in 1 Kings 2," *Textus* 11 (1984) 89–118. Revised edition: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 549–70

–, "Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings"

–, "Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings," in *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (ed. T. Muraoka; SBLSCS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 83–125. Revised edition: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 109–28

–, "Socio-Religious Background"

–, "The Socio-Religious Background of the Paleo-Hebrew Biblical Texts Found at Qumran," in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Cancik et al.; 3 vols., Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1996) 1.353–74

–, *TCU*

–, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2d ed.; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997)

–, *Greek and Hebrew Bible*

–, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible – Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1999)

–, *TCHB*

–, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001)

–, "Place of Masoretic Text"

–, "The Place of the Masoretic Text in Modern Text Editions of the Hebrew Bible: The Relevance of Canon," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L. McDonald and J. A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002) 234–51

–, *Scribal Practices*

–, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004)

–, "Many Forms"

–, "Reflections on the Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch," forthcoming

Tov–Pfann, *Companion Volume*

E. Tov with the collaboration of S. J. Pfann, *Companion Volume to the Dead Sea Scrolls Microfiche Edition* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993; second revised edition, 1995)

Trebolle, *Madrid Qumran Congress*

The Madrid Qumran Congress – Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls – Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991 (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden/Madrid: E. J. Brill, 1992)

–, *Jewish Bible*

–, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden/New York/Grand Rapids: E. J. Brill/Eerdmans, 1998)

Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*

E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (2d ed., revised and enlarged by P. J. Parsons; Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement 46; London: University of London, 1987)

Ulrich, *DSS*
E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 1999)
–, "Septuagint Manuscripts"
–, "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value," in idem, *DSS,* 165–83
Veltri, *Eine Torah*
G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai – Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994)
–, *Gegenwart*
–, *Gegenwart der Tradition – Studien zur jüdischen Literatur und Kulturgeschichte* (JSJSup 69; Leiden/BostonCologne: E. J. Brill, 2002)
Walters, *Text*
P. Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint, Its Corruptions and Their Emendation* (Cambridge: University Press, 1973)
Wellhausen, *Samuel*
J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871)
Wevers, "Early Revision"
J. W. Wevers, "An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers," *ErIsr* 16 (1982) 235*–39*
Yadin, *Temple Scroll*
Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University, Shrine of the Book, 1983)

Other Abbreviations

Aq	Aquila
b.	Babylonian Talmud
BH	Biblical Hebrew
CD	The Damascus Document from the Cairo Geniza
G	Septuagint
IES	Israel Exploration Society
j.	Jerusalem Talmud
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
kaige-Th	*kaige*-Theodotion
K	*Ketiv*
La	Vetus Latina (Old Latin)
LXX	Septuagint
MH	Mishnaic Hebrew
MT	Masoretic Text
OG	Old Greek (translation of the LXX)
OHB	*Oxford Hebrew Bible*
PAM	Palestine Archaeology Museum
Q	*Qere*
S	Peshitta
Syh	Syro-Hexapla
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
Sym	Symmachus
T	Targum
T^{J}	Targum Jonathan
T^{O}	Targum Onqelos
$T^{Ps\text{-}J}$	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Th	Theodotion
UBS	United Bible Societies
V	Vulgate

A. Hebrew Bible

Chapter One

The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible

James Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1986; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989) pp. XII + 239 (including 66 figures)

Few scholars would be able to discuss the spelling of the Hebrew Bible in such a lucid way as James Barr has done in his monograph based on his Schweich lectures of 1986. The work on this topic is a direct corollary of the author's editorial work on the *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon*, which, however, has been suspended in the meantime (p. 13). This is a very important monograph, providing data that are basic for several disciplines, so that a detailed discussion is in order.

The basic concepts and the issues under investigation are outlined in Chapter One. The discussion refers only to MT, although the title of the work, as well as the analysis itself, constantly refers to "the biblical" text and spelling. In Chapter One, the author describes what is meant by spelling and "variable spelling," a concept around which the whole book is built. The data are amply illustrated, such as in figures 1 and 2 which list the distribution of the different spellings of *ephod* (אפד and אפוד) and *tol^{e}dot* in the construct state (that is, תלדת, תולדת, תלדות and תולדות). Words can be spelled with or without *waw*, with or without *yod*, etc., and often these possibilities are multiplied when the variation pertains to two or more positions in the same word. These different spellings are described as "variable," and in Barr's words:

> One out of every few words is a word of potentially variable spelling, so that there are many thousands of cases in the biblical text … the variability of the biblical spelling is one of its fundamental characteristics, and for that reason the recognition of it has been placed in the title of this work … (p. 2).

The author contrasts his own approach with that of Cross and Freedman.[1] These two authors were especially involved in the comparison between the spelling of MT and that of *external* sources, while Barr aims at giving an *internal* description of the biblical spelling. Thus, the major stress of this book is on the distribution of the different spellings within each of the biblical books as well as between them. These are graphically presented in 66 "figures" or "maps," as they are named on

[1] F.M. Cross, Jr. and D.N. Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1952).

p. 4. These figures refer to select examples, and no attempt is made to provide an exhaustive description of the evidence.

The topic must have been "in the air," since at the time when Barr's Schweich lectures – on which the monograph is based – were delivered, another book was published on the same topic.[2] This book likewise analyzes the distribution of the spellings, this time with the aid of computerized data. Its two authors worked independently of Barr, and Barr's views on their work have been published in an extensive review.[3]

When the distribution of the spelling patterns in MT is studied, it is important to agree upon a base text. Scholars realize that there is no such thing as *the* Masoretic Text. Rather, different Masoretic texts are recognized, and it is well known that these texts differ in spelling, not only in the medieval Masoretic codices (e.g., the Leningrad codex $B19^A$ [L] and the Aleppo codex [A]), but also in the much earlier Judean Desert scrolls belonging to the same (proto-)Masoretic family. These Judean Desert scrolls could bring us closer to the source of the Masoretic spelling, but since none of these is preserved in its entirety, not even the more complete ones among them, they have not been considered by Barr as a source for his research. Rather, although not spelling out this approach, he has started directly from the best medieval Ben-Asher text which has been preserved in its entirety, viz., the Leningrad codex $B19^A$ (L) as recorded in *BHS* and Dotan's edition. Alongside these printed editions, the facsimile editions of L and A have also been used together with the concordance of Mandelkern. The very differences between these editions and tools are problematic, and Barr is aware of this. On p. 6, he gives some examples of such differences, and he demonstrates how they affect the statistical picture in the case of low-frequency words. But these differences in spelling between the mentioned editions are the exception rather than the rule. In Barr's words:

> A smallish percentage of divergence must commonly be allowed for, often two or three per cent, sometimes rising to five or so; but I have not found that divergence to be of such a magnitude as to obscure the main lines of the spelling patterns in the Bible as a whole (p. 6).

The book is divided into two parts of unequal length. The first and major part consists of an introductory chapter ("The Problem and the Approach," pp. 1–43) and the main body of evidence (Chapter Two, "The Central Groups of Evidence," pp. 44–167). Chapter One introduces the basic issues and problems. Chapter Two is concerned with locating some general rules within the labyrinth of biblical spelling. The second part (Chapter Three: "Parallels and Combinations," pp. 168–85), on the other hand, stresses the unsystematic character of that spelling.

---

[2] F.I. Andersen and A.D. Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible* (BibOr 41; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986).

[3] *JSS* 33 (1988) 122–31.

Barr redefines known concepts and introduces new concepts in the analysis of the Masoretic spelling on pp. 21 ff. He distinguishes between a group of identical spellings (*block spellings*) of a given word in a certain context ("where a body of text uses the same spelling throughout" [p. 12]) and *rapid alternation* ("where a text passes rapidly back and forward between two or more spellings" [p. 12]). The example given in figure 3 refers to the different spellings of *sh*^{e}*mot* in the Torah, with or without the article, but in the absolute state only. The word is spelled שמת in Num 1:26–32 (4 x), 36–42 (4 x), but שמות in 1:2–24 (6 x). On the other hand, rapid alternation for this word is found in Gen 26:18, where the different spellings appear in the same verse. The latter pattern of spelling is "extremely common and pervasive" (p. 24). According to Barr, the presence of both of these systems or habits in the same context shows that one scribe, and not different ones, was at work. Variety and inconsistency rather than a systematic approach must have characterized the work of the individual scribes.

Another concept described by Barr is the *affix effect* (pp. 14, 25–32). In Barr's words (p. 14), "when words have plural terminations or other suffixes added, this often alters the characteristic spelling away from that found in the absolute singular." The main phenomenon recognizable in this regard is that words that are otherwise spelled *plene*, that is with *waw* or *yod*, lose their *mater lectionis* when an element is affixed to the word. Thus in 215 instances *ʿolam* is written *plene* (עולם), but when a *lamed* is prefixed to the word, it is usually spelled defectively in the Torah (ten times as against two instances of a full spelling – see figure 9). In another case, too, the "affix effect" is at work in the Torah. In that corpus, הגדל, with the article, is more frequent than הגדול, while גדול is the frequent spelling in that word without the article. Outside the Torah, the word is always spelled *plene*. The *-im* endings of masculine nouns written without *yod* (p. 47) are a special case since they often preserve the middle *mater lectionis*. In the formulation of this "affix effect," Barr tries to reach a better understanding of what previously has been taken as the avoidance of juxtaposing two *plene* spellings.

On the basis of these new definitions and perceptions the author formulates "the central question" in the evaluation of these spellings (pp. 32–3). The formulation of this central question actually pertains only to the issues raised by the "affix effect," although the following pages are not limited to this issue. The two possible explanations suggested by Barr refer either to the linguistic level (differences in stress between the defective and *plene* forms) or to the scribal level (differentiation between words that were "alone" and those that had affixes).

In section 12 of Chapter One the author notices a very special feature of the Masoretic spelling. Certain words are spelled consistently in a certain way, a situation that is quite unusual within the inconsistent Masoretic practice. Thus the following words are always spelled defectively: נאם, מאד, כהן, משה, אלהים. The latter three cases are described by Barr as a "lexically selective convention" (p. 36); the first two are described as possibly reflecting a different pronunciation.

The author also suggests that the book in MT, above all else, should be considered as the basic unit for spelling analysis. After all, spelling pertains to scribal activity, and not to the level of composition of books or of their constituting layers. In principle, we would thus expect books to be more or less homogeneous in their spelling practices. Thus the ancient songs in the Torah and the surrounding chapters, written at a later time, are expected to reflect the same spelling patterns. Indeed, the ancient song of Deborah contains various *plene* spellings "in words in which a shorter spelling would be possible and even normal" (p. 37).

Barr presents very interesting insights into the nature of the spelling patterns of the Torah which are more substantial than generalizations previously made in the literature on the subject. It is usually said that the Torah has more short spellings than the other (later) books, but Barr points out that this characterization is imprecise: the spelling of the Torah oscillates between full and defective where other books present a full spelling only. Short spellings are actually a minority within the Torah as a whole (pp. 39–43), but they do abound in Exodus.

After these preliminary deliberations the author reaches the main body of evidence (Chapter Two: "The Central Groups of Evidence") comprising the bulk of the book. In 123 pages, the author discusses 21 categories of variable spellings, "especially, those which seem to yield important clues for the understanding of biblical spelling in general" (p. 44). In the course of the analysis, concepts are employed which have been introduced in the first chapter; the material is significant, though not exhaustive, and it is meant to lead to general conclusions on the spelling. The basic pattern of analysis in this chapter is descriptive, but the common denominator of the examples is that a certain pattern behind the spelling practices can be determined. In spite of the basic problems in the analysis of the Masoretic spelling, patterns can be recognized, and these present an important contribution by Barr. He does not say how often his findings agree with those of the Masoretes, such as in Elias Levita's *Massoreth ha-Massoreth*, for some rules had already been detected by them. Often the author simply presents the material, but more frequently it is accompanied by an explanation of the variable spellings, usually in the realm of linguistic features.

Such is the case with the different spellings of the masculine plural ending *-im*, which presents a special type of "affix effect" in which often the final *yod* is lacking, while the internal one is written (p. 47). This situation is explained by the assumption of different stress patterns. The spelling תמימים presents the stress on the ultimate syllable, while תמימם (the majority spelling for this word, yet a minority spelling for the pattern as a whole) reflects the penultimate stress. This suggestion is presented with all due caution.

A linguistic explanation has also been attached to several of the occurrences of the *qaṭol* pattern. Most of the words of this pattern are spelled in different ways, though mainly *plene*. In the Torah, the "affix effect" is also visible (pp. 53–4). Linguistically interesting is a small group of words belonging to the same pat-

tern which are never spelled *plene*: גבה, עמק, קטן and probably also עגל (with one exception: 2 Chr 4:2). These cases are not explained as lexically determined. Rather, Barr prefers to see in them a different pattern (*qaṭal*): they did not have the long vowel which could produce long spellings, but an *a* vowel or a short *u* vowel, also present in קְטַנָּה, etc.

The different spelling patterns of the *qal* participle *qoṭel*, *qoṭelet*, etc., written either with or without *waw* are discussed as well. Defective forms are four times more frequent in MT than full forms. There are, however, words that go against this trend. Thus יושב is more frequently full than the other words, probably because of a possible conflict between יֹשֵׁב and יֹשֵׁב. The distribution pattern differs from word to word, so that the behavior of individual words ("lexicalization" [p. 80]) has to be taken into consideration together with the general trend. Beyond the behavior of individual words, Barr suggests a linguistic solution for the different spelling patterns. He cautiously surmises (p. 77) that "the Canaanite sound shift from *a* to *o* had not yet taken uniform effect in Hebrew." Therefore some participles were actually of the pattern *qaṭel* and *qaṭil* and accordingly spelled without *waw*. These spellings thus reflect a different linguistic reality, which was later misunderstood by the Masoretes as reflecting *qoṭel*. But Barr immediately adds: "Yet it is difficult to suppose that the shift in question was still incomplete as late as this hypothesis would demand. Nor would it easily explain why *so many* participles, even in late books, are defective." (p. 77). Another possible explanation of the defective spellings is that many verbs were at a certain time of the stative type, that is אָהֵב instead of אוֹהֵב. But the issue cannot really be decided. Possibly there nevertheless existed a scribal tradition that made the scribes decide to prefer *plene* forms for nouns and defective forms for verbal forms. Since, however, this solution is applicable only to a certain percentage of the evidence, Barr cannot form a conclusion in any one direction.

The *yod* of the *hiphʿil* is not mandatory, or, in other words, *hiphʿil* forms are either defective or full. The defective forms are explained as possible remnants of a different pronunciation, viz., with an *a* instead of with an *i* (pp. 84–5).

Explanations along these lines abound in the book. But Barr did not start his investigations with a linguistic theory in mind. In his words, "My main concern is not to discover an explanation of how the biblical spelling patterns arose but to describe what these patterns are: in that sense the work starts out by being descriptive rather than historical" (p. 3). However correct these words, which introduce the present work, were when the author embarked upon his research, it would appear that as the research continued, he found himself opting more and more for a historical-linguistic solution. Thus Barr's real approach is better reflected in those introductory words in which he realizes with some surprise that he actually accepts a historical approach:

> Nevertheless I must say that, having started off in this rather non-historical direction, I found in the course of my studies that the evidence gradually led me round to a more

historical assessment, and that a study based on the Masoretic patterns alone led to more historical and developmental suggestions than I had originally thought likely, *or wished* [my italics, E. T.]. This is how it should be: the examination of the patterns of the basic body of evidence, the traditional biblical text, should provide a strengthening of the base for historical understanding (p. 4).

Therefore, in actual fact the author's approach, not his results, is not as different from that of Cross–Freedman as he would have liked it to be.

In several other issues, Barr provided a historical-linguistic explanation as well. All these pertain to the evidence provided in Chapter Two ("The Central Groups of Evidence"), the longest chapter in the book. In addition to the examples mentioned above, this explanation pertains to the defective spellings of the *waw* consecutive of the perfect (pp. 97–103), the *o* vowel of the imperfect *qal* in triliteral verbs (pp. 103–7) and the second person masculine termination *-ta* and *-ka* (pp. 114–27). In a long discussion, the author suggests that the *plene* writings of this type reflect "an older style which had been reduced in numbers in the later history of the text" (p. 125). In this case, a different pronunciation is assumed. Barr always expresses his views with due caution and sometimes he almost rejects the historical solution he suggested himself; see, for example, his analysis of a *yod* before suffixes (אלהם, etc.) on p. 137.

Barr's lengthy analysis of select patterns of variable spellings is but one aspect of this book. In Chapter Three, he turns to a different type of evidence, viz., "Parallels and Combinations." Some of these data are presented in the conventional comparative way, while other data present a new approach. The material is analyzed from a completely different angle: while Chapter Two was concerned with detecting rules behind the Masoretic spelling, Chapter Three describes only a few such rules, while stressing its unsystematic character.

In this chapter, the author compares the spelling patterns of parallel sections in the Bible, viz., Chronicles // Samuel-Kings, Exodus 25–30 // 35–40, and 2 Samuel 22 // Psalm 18. There are various ways of looking at the material, and the author is especially intrigued by the shorter spellings in Chronicles. That book is obviously later than Samuel–Kings, and in accordance with the history of the development of the spelling procedures, a greater number of full spellings are expected in that book. This is indeed the case, but the situation is somewhat more complicated, as Chronicles sometimes has a shorter spelling. Since it is not logical that the author or scribe of this book would have inserted these shorter spellings, another type of solution should be attempted. In Barr's formulation:

The hypothesis that, where parallel texts exist, they derived from an earlier form of the text that was generally shorter, and that was thereafter amplified in slightly different ways, and haphazardly rather than systematically, is the simplest explanation, and gives us means to understand the essential problem, namely the fact that the existing texts seem, in numerous individual cases, to go against their own dominant tendencies (p. 170).

This assumption is worked out in detail for Chronicles and its sources on pp. 178–82. A similar explanation is applied to a comparison of the two Exodus texts. Their spelling practices display a large amount of agreement, and in addition the two texts differ, as tabulated on pp. 174–5. Both of the texts were derived from "an earlier text that was dominantly short, and … both of them independently added a certain number of *waw*s and *yod*s, both of them inconsistently and haphazardly" (p. 177). Although in this section the author discusses some select patterns, he describes the spelling practices in the traditional way, that is, assuming a development from a defective to a full spelling. At the same time there is room for exceptions, since the author has an explanation for defective spellings in Chronicles that, as far as I know, is novel (see the description above). He also describes a model for the possible distinction between layers of spelling within Chronicles based on certain literary assumptions.

In another section of this chapter, pp. 182–4, which deals with "combinations of variable spellings," the author treats the parallel data as he did in Chapter Two, viz., word by word. The different patterns of behavior of several combinations of words in the parallel sections are studied in this section.

The final chapter, Four, deals with "Interpretation and Implications," summarizing the author's views on the rationale of the spelling of MT. The suggestion that the variable spellings should be explained as simply inconsistent (Bergsträsser, Bauer-Leander) is not acceptable to Barr. Nor does he accept a suggestion of Rahlfs (1916) that the *matres lectionis* have been added in order to overcome ambiguity. As counter arguments to the latter view, Barr provides several examples of ambiguous words in which scribes could easily have added a letter in order to remove an ambiguity in the text, but refrained from doing so (note e. g. the two occurrences of ימים in Num 9:22, of which the first one is vocalized as *yamim* and the second one as *yomayim*). At the same time, vowel letters were inserted in words that without them would not have been ambiguous (e. g., שופר). As a further argument against this view, the author refers to the "affix effect" described above. Barr rightly claims: "If yods or waws were put there in order to assist identification and reduce ambiguity, why were they so very often removed again as soon as the words in question became plural or had a pronoun suffix or even a definite article?" (p. 189). He also notes that the "massive use of defective spelling in the Bible" (p. 190) can only imply that the avoidance of ambiguity was not a major factor behind the spelling practices.

The solution accepted by Barr is of a different nature. "Spelling varied because the scribes liked it to vary … In other words, biblical spelling … is a kind of art form. It is somewhat comparable to calligraphy" (p. 194). The distinction between conscious and unconscious is very important in this regard. Some variations will have been made unconsciously, but many of them were conscious. For example, there are many variable spellings fitting patterns that probably existed in the Hebrew language in the pre-Masoretic period (p. 195). The aforementioned words

which show no variable spelling (נאם, אלהים, etc.) also show a design behind the spelling patterns. There are also very clear patterns of differences between the books. Accepted spellings changed from time to time, such as the two major spellings for the name of David, and this, too, shows an overall design. Usually the earlier works were more defective than the later ones, but books were revised, copied, and recopied so that the usual chronological criteria do not hold. All these factors, then, explain the different spelling patterns, but at the same time they show a conscious procedure behind the spelling habits.

At the same time, Barr makes some suggestions with regard to the chronological background of the Masoretic spelling. As remarked, there is no necessary relation between the time of composition of the books and the spelling of the copies included in MT. *Grosso modo*, Barr considers the period between 400 and 100 BCE as the time of origin of the spelling practices of MT. The author did not find evidence for the concept of "archaizing" (p. 203).

In his final remarks, Barr draws together the different observations gathered in the course of his research. There is but one orthographic system reflected in MT. Within that system, there were often different options that could be chosen, each as valid as the other. Barr thus talks about "one orthography, which included a zone of optional spelling" (p. 205). This zone included the variable spellings.

Barr appends a few notes (pp. 209–11) about the practical consequences of his research. He suggests that grammars should discuss spelling patterns, that a full-scale grammar and concordance of the spellings of MT should be written, and finally that the commentators of individual books should pay special attention to spelling patterns. In an appendix (pp. 212–15), Barr describes a "specimen profile of one book: the Psalms."

We now turn to some further matters of evaluation.

Every reader of the book will be impressed by its thoroughness, novelty, lucidity and Barr's pleasant way of discussing the different options. Scholars who think that these minutiae are unimportant are mistaken, as Barr has shown that they may pertain to many aspects of biblical studies: the date of composition and copying of the biblical books and textual as well as linguistic analysis. For the insider, this book can be read as a novel which one reads in one sitting, as the reviewer has done. It is actually quite surprising that a book like this has not been written earlier, since so many studies have been written which should actually have been preceded by a monograph like the present one. Probably the magnitude of such an undertaking prevented others from embarking upon research of this kind. Others may have thought that the main facts are actually known, and yet others may have thought that the "inconsistency" of MT makes such research impossible. Hence, scholars have had to wait for the novel insights, wide knowledge and patience of J. Barr who has applied to the material new categories of thinking, as outlined in the beginning of this review. Some of these

run parallel to work carried out independently by Andersen and Forbes in their aforementioned work, but equally often the two studies go in different directions. Barr leads us to the period of the writing of the proto-Masoretic texts, although he does not elaborate on this issue. The book provides much food for thought on the background on the different spelling patterns in MT as well as between the different books. And finally, attempts are made – and this is quite novel, as far as I know – to connect the different spelling habits with practices of pronunciation and language. Barr suggests that many of the phenomena described do not reflect different spelling practices, but different linguistic habits.

One of the important insights of Barr is to look beyond the mere statistics of spelling patterns. General statistics of *plene* and defective spellings are of limited value. Of more relevance are statistics of certain patterns, such as the endings *-im* and *-ot*, the participle and the *hiph'il*, but even here certain words go against the usual practice. Examples of these have been given above. These select words, whose spelling goes its own way, make the study of this topic particularly interesting.

In our evaluation of this study, we first turn to the textual base of the investigations, which is the Leningrad codex with some exceptions (see above). According to Barr, the differences between the *medieval* sources are negligible, but at the same time the reader would like to know which text is actually quoted throughout the work. The implication of a statement on p. 7 seems to be that the textual base for the research is a combination of A and L (mentioned in this sequence). But on p. 19, the author says that the spellings in the diagrams are "generally" those of "BHS, following the Leningrad Codex." Are we to assume that in those cases in which a spelling other than that of *BHS* (L) is mentioned, it is the spelling of the Aleppo codex? Probably not. The reader should realize that this detail is of minor significance, since the number of consonantal differences between L and A is small, but nevertheless he should have more clarity about the textual base of the "figures." We should probably assume that the textual base is always the *BHS* (not always identical with L!) with the exception of those cases for which codex L is mentioned explicitly (see however Barr's preference for A on p. 210). These exceptions could easily be traced with the aid of the index, and if this assumption that *BHS* is the base is correct, the reader has more clarity with regard to the textual base of Barr's investigations. And to what extent has Dotan's edition of codex L been used? Mandelkern's concordance does not serve as a base for these investigations, although Barr has used this tool in order to locate the different words. On the whole, he prefers this concordance to other tools (p. 210), but the reason is not stated. Lisowski's concordance, which is based on the text of *BH*, could have brought the author closer to that source (I do not know how precise this concordance is). Often Barr states (for examples, see the index *s. v.* Mandelkern) that the data in Mandelkern differ in details from *BHS*. This is not surprising since the textual base for that concordance

(*Biblia Rabbinica*, the edition of Baer, and other sources) differs from *BHS*, but the mentioning of these details will be useful to the readers, many of whom use Mandelkern.

The reason for the choice of codex L is not mentioned. One can easily conjecture that this manuscript is chosen as the best complete representative of the Ben-Asher tradition. However, that choice pertains to matters of vocalization and Masorah, and not necessarily to its consonants. The choice is actually not discussed. Possibly another source would have presented us with a better base for an investigation of the consonantal Masoretic tradition. It is not impossible that the detailed research carried out by Menahem Cohen on subgroups within the Masoretic manuscripts (for some references, see Barr's bibliography) would lead to the choice of another manuscript or even of two or more manuscripts. Even if such a different choice was made, the contents of the tables would not differ from the present ones by more than 3–5 percent, that is the margin which Barr is willing to accept according to the aforementioned quote from p. 6. But here and there an additional block might be recognized and, conversely, the assumption of a spelling block might sometimes have to be cancelled.

There is one further issue pertaining to the textual base for the research performed. It is never fair to expect from authors who performed so much research to point to other areas that should have been researched as well, but it seems that at least some guidelines or sample studies are needed in the area of the ancient scrolls. The spelling patterns of MT were not created in the Middle Ages. The only reason why the earliest medieval manuscripts are studied is that they form the best extant complete source for the study of early orthographic patterns. After all, the Masoretic manuscripts have been transmitted very carefully so that they are probably an excellent base for the study of earlier practices. The ancient scrolls belonging to the same (proto-)Masoretic family reflect an almost identical consonantal text (see chapter 12*) especially the Judean Desert scrolls from sites other than Qumran. If differences between codices L and A are taken into consideration, why should one disregard much earlier, and hence better, representatives of the same Masoretic family from Masada, Murabbaʿat, and Naḥal Ḥever, and also Qumran? Sample studies of ancient scrolls could indicate possible trends at an earlier period. This pertains to such well-preserved texts as 1QIsa^{b}, the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever, and several of the Masada texts. For example, the unusual *plene* spelling יעקוב in the MT of Lev 26:42 and Jeremiah (30:18; 33:26; 46:27; 51:19 [note also ten defective spellings in that book]) is also found in other places in 4QJer^{c} (30:7; 31:7, 11 [?], 18; other instances are not known because of its fragmentary status); the defective spelling occurs 345 times in MT. The exact status of the spelling of this name in 4QJer^{c} is of course not clear, but this and similar data are very relevant to the discussion on p. 162 of the book because they antedate the medieval manuscripts by at least one millennium. It should be stressed once again that I do not refer to the

relevance of any earlier text; I refer only to those texts from the Judean Desert, which according to the scholarly consensus belong to the (proto)-Masoretic group (family). See further chapter 10* below.

We now turn to the samples provided, their description, and the accompanying theories in Chapters One and Two. The existence of the "affix effect" previously described as the avoidance of *plene* spellings in two successive syllables, has certainly been established before Barr and by Barr himself, but since the author presents special aspects of this phenomenon, our only source of information is provided by the examples given, and these are sometimes problematic. The data provided are far from exhaustive for completeness was not the author's intention. Nevertheless enough relevant material is provided. No information is hidden, but the reader should always read the samples carefully. Often they do not pertain to the Bible as a whole, but to certain books only, or only to a certain form of the noun (absolute or construct only), often in certain books only. Thus figure 9, mentioned above, quotes "all cases in the Torah" of *lᵉʿolam* (forever) and it pertains to the "affix effect." The author notes that there are some 205 instances of *ʿolam* written *plene* in MT. He then continues to say: "But, when preceded by *lᵉ*- (not עד), in the familiar phrase *lᵉʿolam* "for ever," this proportion changes sharply: within the Torah we have the defective, לעלם, ten times, and the *plene* לעולם only twice …" After the table, the author mentions ומעלם in Isa 57:11 in a similarly short spelling. However, the mentioning of this one example is problematic since the great majority of the instances of this word are spelled *plene* (17x, not mentioned by Barr). Likewise, העלם, with the article, is mentioned as an example for the "affix effect." But the latter case actually runs counter to the author's claim, since it is represented only in two cases with the short spelling "out of about a dozen." Also the massive information about *ʿolam* with *lᵉ*, not mentioned by the author, goes against his rule. That is, the great majority of the spellings of *lᵉʿolam* are actually *plene*, to be precise 175 times in all the books of the Bible, most of them in Psalms, as against a mere seven defective spellings in 1 Kings (4 x) and Psalms (3 x). In spite of all this, the information in figure 9 is basically correct, as it pertains only to the Torah, where the basic information is not contradicted, but the information concerning the other books is imprecise, and this may have some repercussions for the situation in the Torah as well.

The preceding example may or may not render the case of the "affix effect" less convincing. Actually Barr does not say in so many words whether the "affix effect" is found throughout the Bible or merely in a certain unit, in this case the Torah. If, by default, one believes that the "affix effect" is found in all of the Bible, one would have to admit that the data are less convincing, for they pertain mainly to the Torah with contrary evidence from the other books. On the whole, in our view the case would be stronger if one should claim that the phenomenon is particularly discernable in a given book and if its presence there is well demonstrable. But one does not know whether this is Barr's intention for,

in the discussion in Chapter Two, reference to the "affix effect" also pertains to books other than the Torah.

The examples given for the "affix effect" are not always convincing, in my view. As one of the examples of the "affix effect," the author mentions on p. 27 עשות, which when preceded by a *lamed* is written defectively (לעשת). For this phenomenon, Barr quotes twelve examples, which in normal conditions would be convincing, but when remembering that there are at least two hundred instances of the *plene* writing of this word (לעשות), *not* mentioned on p. 27, one wonders whether the example is at all valid. The data mentioned by Barr thus refer to a minority of the instances; how can we use them as proof for an assumption that is contradicted by the bulk of the evidence?

The numbers of the defective spellings of *qol* deriving from the "affix effect" as listed on p. 29 are correct, but they form a small minority. But Barr adds an important observation: "… there is not a single case of the defective spelling קל except where there is an affix conjoined with the noun."

The author thus does not stress the statistical data, but he follows a different type of logic, spelled out with regard to *qol*, and which has much to be commended. According to that logic it is not the number of defective affixed forms that count, but the fact that these defective forms occur mainly with affixes and often in unexpected places, such as in a late book. The addition of affixes, so the argument goes, influenced the scribe to write the word defectively, even if this happened in a small number of cases only. In our view, however, this position, logical as it may seem to be, can only be upheld by strong evidence relating either to a given word or morphological pattern or to a given biblical book.

Another example mentioned in favor of the present formulation of the "affix effect" is *qadosh*, mainly spelled *plene* as קדוש – but why is this example mentioned in this chapter? What is the "affix effect" here? The author notes "… with the article this adjective is always קדוש plene …" (p. 27).

On pp. 28–9, the author mentions several examples of words that are *plene* in their construct forms, as opposed to their defective absolute forms, e. g. the construct ארון as opposed to the absolute ארן, in the Torah only (as opposed to all other books in which only the *plene* forms occur). But here, Barr notes, the "affix effect" works in the opposite direction, and one wonders whether these data actually do not weaken the initial assumption.

There certainly is evidence for some form or other of the "affix effect," which has been recognized also before Barr, but possibly it was operational only for certain scribes in certain cases. Barr shows (pp. 25–6) that the phenomenon which previously has been described as the avoidance of *plene* spelling in two successive syllables, is imprecise and not warranted by the data. Instead, he provides a better description of the evidence. But, it seems to us, there remain some open questions. Thus the existence of the "affix effect" in all of the books has not been established, and it is not clear whether this was Barr's intention. The case made

would have been stronger if we could say that in a certain book or group of books the "affix effect" is used exclusively, and not contradicted by negative evidence. An alternative explanation could be that the "affix effect" would be operational in all of MT for certain words only, so that negative evidence relating to other words would not be relevant.

A similar consideration of a general nature pertains to a concept introduced by Barr, viz., that of block spellings as opposed to rapid alternation. According to Barr, the combination of block spellings and rapid alternation is one of the characteristic features of the Masoretic spelling system. Examples are given from both the Torah and the historical books. The data speak for themselves, and they are impressive. But the issue at stake, in my mind, is the question to what extent the described phenomena were intentional. For Barr, they probably reflect a conscious process, since he speaks about rapid alternation and in various places he describes the spelling as a conscious process. Although Barr does not say so in so many words, the assumption behind his description seems to be that someone created the alternation between block spellings and rapid alternation. But in order to prove this point much more evidence needs to be adduced, in my view. The examples themselves are not numerous enough. Alternatively, can one point to a certain book or group of books in which the block spelling is a clear-cut phenomenon? Furthermore, what is the logic behind the presumed alternation? After all, if the suggested view cannot be demonstrated convincingly, we may have to return to the old-fashioned view that inconsistency is at stake. Simple "inconsistency" is another way of formulating the combination of block spellings and rapid alternation. But inconsistency cannot be proven. It is an assumption in itself.

This leads to even more general thoughts about the book under review. In the two main sections of the work, Barr discusses different aspects of the Masoretic spelling by approaching the evidence from different angles. In the greater part of the book (Chapters One and Two), the author discusses individual patterns of spellings, pointing out time and again the reasons for the variable spellings. The discussion in the second part (Chapter Three), on the other hand, stresses the unsystematic nature of that spelling on the basis of an analysis of parallel sections. The haphazard nature of the spelling is stressed especially in the concluding section (see below). In other words, the implication of Chapters One and Two actually differs from that of Chapter Three. Barr is aware of this, and he always phrases his thoughts carefully. But one wonders whether the results of the second part of the book are sufficiently taken into consideration in its first part. In his general conclusions, Barr writes:

> For the obvious character of biblical spelling is its *haphazardness*. Consistency is at a discount, and variation at a premium. As we have repeatedly observed and insisted, the variations run across all books, all sources, all periods. Exceptions are not exceptional but are the normal thing (pp. 202–3).

But if this is the case, should this perception not influence the concepts and analysis developed in the first part of the book as well? In other words, if variation is the rule ("spelling varied because the scribes liked it to vary" [p. 194]), can the concepts of "block spelling" and "rapid alternation" as conscious procedures be maintained, especially since the examples are not clear-cut? Or would it be better to simply talk about various forms of inconsistency? And does the very fact of the inconsistency not cast any doubts on some of the evidence explained otherwise in Chapters One and Two? After all, the evidence is not always convincing (see also above). Would it not be better to turn to an assumption of inconsistency?

This is a very important study. Barr has discovered several spelling features and he offered attractive suggestions for single phenomena and lexemes. Accordingly, the main question for discussion is not the validity of these single phenomena and spelling patterns for certain lexemes, but the validity of the generalizations behind the description of these single phenomena. Can the overall explanations of Barr (alternation of block spelling and rapid alternation, the special nature of the "affix effect") be maintained? Barr has taught us not to look at mere statistics, but to consider general trends and to look separately at the words behind these statistics. Accordingly, one can probably accommodate both an assumption of inconsistency in general and the consistent behavior of certain words and patterns. In a way, however, judgment should be delayed until each of the books of MT is discussed separately and thoroughly.

These doubts and precautions beyond the already cautious approach of Barr do cast further doubts on the validity of the linguistic-historical explanations of the spelling practices so often suggested in this work (e. g., the assumption of a pattern *qaṭal* behind the defective spellings of the Masoretic *qaṭol*, see above). If inconsistency is the rule for MT, rather than the exception, why can we not ascribe many of these unusual spellings to the inconsistencies of scribes, rather than to a different linguistic reality? Scribes of individual books had their idiosyncrasies (this is also visible in MT as a whole; see the consistently defective spellings of e. g., מאד, כהן, נאם), and why should other idiosyncrasies not be ascribed to the same scribes rather than to a different linguistic reality? Do we have to assume different pronunciation patterns for the *hiphʿil*, for the participle, and for the plural formations *-im* and *-ot* if we can equally well work with the assumption of scribal conventions and (in)consistency? Besides, these linguistic explanations are ascribed to spellings found in all of MT, and Barr is aware of the fact that the different linguistic reality so often mentioned in the book would have to be assumed for quite a long period and at quite a late stage of the language.

Although there remain some open questions, they do not detract from the fact that this is a masterly study, which will remain a basic work for the study of the Masoretic spelling for many years to come.

Chapter Two

Deuteronomy 12 and 11QTemple[a] LII–LIII: A Contrastive Analysis

Both Deuteronomy and 11QTemple[a] are law codes. The former forms the base for a great part of the latter, thus facilitating their comparison. In such a contrastive comparison, the different approaches of the two codes are easily recognized.

1.

Deuteronomy 12–26 contains a law code of a special type. It does not merely record laws, but also enjoins the audience to abide by them. In order to achieve this purpose, the author employs various devices. Incentives for obeying and punishments for disobeying the law are specified. The author frequently repeats himself, often with identical wording, in order to emphasize the content. Some portions of the legal sections of Deuteronomy are, in fact, more in the nature of legislative sermons than a legal code.

This is the case with chapter 12, the beginning of the legal code. It may safely be asserted that this chapter, the content of which carries a central message within Deuteronomy, would have been considerably shorter had it been confined to merely legislative aspects. Indeed, the legal prescriptions of the chapter can be summarized in a few sentences, while the remainder of the chapter should be regarded as a "legal sermon" (comprising 28 verses).

The legal prescriptions of this chapter may be summarized as:

a. All worship must be centralized at one chosen place;
b. Non-sacrificial slaughter is permitted "far" from the chosen place.

The lengthiness of the chapter derives not only from the sermons surrounding the legal prescriptions, but also from its complicated literary history, as its present form reflects two compositional layers, viz. **1**: (a) 11:31[1]–12:7; (b) 12:8–12 (14); **2**: (b) 12:13 (15)–19; (a) 12:20–28. For our present purpose, we need not insist on any specific theory on the growth of this chapter, but its repetitive nature is beyond doubt. Thus, the regulation that all worship was to be centralized in one place is phrased three times (vv 5, 11, 14) and the allowing of non-sacrificial

[1] The subject matter of chapter 12 starts at 11:31.

slaughter beyond the chosen place is repeated twice in great detail (vv 15–16; 20–24).

The two regulations of chapter 12 are phrased in such a way that it may be suspected that they once formed two separate sources. Over the course of time, the original regulation regarding the centralization of worship was found too difficult and impractical, so a second layer was added enabling those who were "far" from the chosen city to eat meat without sacrifice.[2] A tension exists between the two regulations, not because the second one severely limits the force of the first one – after all, that was the purpose of the law – but because the first one (12:1–12 [14]) is phrased in strong terms and leaves no opening for the possibility of the second one. The spirit in which the first regulation is written contradicts the very existence of a mitigating law such as the second one. Thus, the two regulations apparently reflect two different periods.

2.

From col. LI 11 onwards, 11QT[a] adduces large sections of the text of Deut 16:18 ff., together with other laws from the Torah, ordered according to the chapter sequence in Deuteronomy, but also organized topically within that arrangement. This topical arrangement involves various digressions, *inter alia* the text of Deuteronomy 12. The first regulation of that chapter is quoted very briefly, not in the absolute terms of the biblical text (Deut 12:1–12 [14]), but integrating the second, mitigating, regulation:

13 לוא תזבח שור ושה ועז טהורים[3]
14 בכול שעריכה קרוב למקדשי דרך שלושת ימים כי אם בתוך
15 מקדשי תזבחנו לעשות אותו עולה או זבח שלמים ואכלתה
16 ושמחתה לפני במקום אשר אבחר לשום שמי עליו

A contrastive analysis of Deuteronomy 12 and 11QT[a] is instructive for our understanding of both compositions:

a. 11QT[a], as expected, treats the two regulations presented twice in Deuteronomy 12, as one entity.

b. The centralization of the cult, described in detail in Deut 12:1–12 (14) and Leviticus 17 (cf. n. 3), has been reduced to a mere four lines in 11QTemple. The author of that scroll was thus guided by the correct intuition that the basic mes-

[2] The secondary nature of this second regulation can be recognized by a comparison with other chapters containing a similar formulation to that in 12:20–21. See the second layer of the law of the tithe (14:24 ff.), enabling people "far" from the chosen city to sell the tithe for money to be spent in the chosen city. Likewise, a second layer in the law of the cities of refuge mentions three additional cities (19:8–10) to the three mentioned earlier (19:7). The additional cities were to be instituted upon the expansion of the country (19:8).

[3] Cf. also the parallel law in Lev 17:3.

sage of Deut 12:1–12 (14) was very short and that the bulk of that pericope was not needed in a legislative composition. Our literary understanding of the nature of this chapter is thus corroborated by 11QT[a].

c. The biblical law does not specify how far removed the Israelite has to be from the chosen city (cf. Deut 12:21) in order to practice non-sacrificial slaughter. This problem is solved in 11QT[a] LII 14, which designates this distance as "three days walk."[4] The contrastive analysis thus shows that the biblical law lacked certain elements for its practical implementation.

d. 11QT[a] infers from the biblical text that the inhabitants of the region close to the Temple are not allowed to eat non-sacrificial meat. This seems to be the most logical inference from the text, which is also accepted by the Qaraites, but not by rabbinic Judaism.

The author of 11QT[a] was guided by a literary feeling that often runs parallel to that of modern critical scholars, as illustrated by his treatment of the second regulation in Deuteronomy 12, the sanctioning of non-sacrificial meat outside the chosen city. The subject of the text lost between cols. LII 21 and LIII 1 is not known, but the first eight lines of col. LIII run parallel to Deut 12:20–25, with which they can be aligned in parallel columns:

	MT	11QTemple[a] LIII 2–8
20	…כי תאוה נפשך לאכל בשר	כי א]וֹתה נפשכה לאכול ב[שר
	בכל אות נפשך תאכל בשר	בכול אות נפשכה] תואכל בּשׂ[ר
21	כי ירחק ממך המקום אשר יבחר	
	ה׳ אלהיך לשום שמו שם	
	וזבחת מבקרך ומצאנך	ו]בּ[חת]ה מצואנכה ומבקריכה
	אשר נתן ה׳ לך	כברכתּי אשר אתן לכה
	כאשר צויתך	
	ואכלת בשעריך	ואכלתה בשעריכה
	בכל אות נפשך	
22	אך כאשר יאכל את הצבי ואת האיל	
	כן תאכלנו	
	הטמא והטהור יחדו יאכלנו	והטהור והטמא בכה יחדיו כצבי וכאיל
23	רק חזק לבלתי אכל הדם	רק חזק לבלתי אכול הדם[5]
	כי הדם הוא הנפש	כי הדם הוא הנפש
	ולא תאכל הנפש עם הבשר	ולוֹא תואכל את הנפש עם הבשר
24	לא תאכלנו	
	על הארץ תשפכנו כמים	על הארץ תשופכנו כמים וכסיתו בעפר (Lev 17:13)
25	לא תאכלנו	
	למען ייטב לך ולבניך אחריך	למען ייטב (יוטב)[6] לכה ולבניכה אחריכה עד עולם
	כי תעשה הישר בעיני ה׳	ועשיתה הישר והטוב לפני
		אני ה׳ אלוהיכה

[4] For a similar solution in the case of the tithe, see 11QT[a] XLIII 12–13.

[5] 11QT[a] adduces here the text that runs parallel to v 24 and to Lev 17:13.

[6] Yadin's reading.

The content of this regulation appears twice in Deuteronomy (12:15–19 and 12:20–28), but only once in 11QT[a], according to its second formulation (Deut 12:20–28). In that rewritten text, a phrase from the first formulation of the law is incorporated (כברכתי אשר אתן לכה, parallel to Deut 12:21 אשר נתן ה׳ לך, but derived from Deut 12:15).

It is remarkable, as we have stated, how 11QT[a] succeeded in condensing and omitting many of the repetitions in the biblical text:

i. The law in vv 20–28 is prefaced by two introductions: (20) כי ירחיב ה׳ אלהיך את גבלך כאשר דבר לך, and (21) כי ירחק ממך המקום אשר יבחר ה׳ אלהיך לשום שמו שם, while the preserved part of 11QT[a] col. LIII has left no remnant of an introduction to the law. However, the text of the scroll omits the first part of Deut 12:21 (כי ירחק … שמו שם), with v 21b appearing immediately after v 20. It is therefore safe to assume that the section was introduced by one prefatory phrase only viz.: [כי ארחיב את גבולכה כאשר דברתי לכה ואמרתה אוכלה בשר כי א]ותה וגו׳.[7]

ii. Several phrases have been omitted in 11QT[a] because they merely repeat other phrases in the immediate context:

(21) בכל אות נפשך (implied in line 2 [כי א]ותה נפשכה)

(22) אך כאשר יאכל את הצבי ואת האיל (abbreviated in the next phrase to כצבי וכאיל)

(22) כן תאכלנו, (24) לא תאכלנו, (25) לא תאכלנו ("redundant" repetitions).

This contrastive analysis of Deuteronomy 12 and 11QT[a] LII–LIII brings to the fore the differences in their approaches. 11QT[a] presents a more practical approach to the biblical law than Deuteronomy 12. A similar difference is visible in a contrastive analysis of Lev 23:27–29 and 11QT[a] XXV 10–12.[8]

---

[7] The immediate joining of two introductory phrases as suggested by Yadin (כי ארחיב את גבולכה … וכי ירחק ממכה …) is inconsistent with the avoidance of repetition in this section. Yadin's suggestion may have been guided by the reading of a single letter [ממכה] ק[ירח] in line 1, but that letter is questionable.

[8] For other aspects of the editorial technique of 11QT[a], see S. A. Kaufman, "The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism," *HUCA* 53 (1982) 29–43; P. R. Callaway, "Source Criticism of the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 12 (1985–1986) 213–22; G. Brin, "Concerning Some of the Uses of the Bible in the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 12 (1987) 519–28.

Chapter Three

4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of Its Contents

The reconstructed text of 4QReworked Pentateuch (previously: 4QPentateuchal Paraphrase or 4QPP) is one of the longest texts found at Qumran, with the complete scroll measuring 22–27 meters.[1] A large amount of text has been preserved in many fragments that come from the five extant manuscripts of this text. Four manuscripts were published in *DJD* XIII, while a fifth one was published earlier as 4Q158.[2] In a previous publication[3] I argued that this manuscript belongs to the same text as 4Q364–367.[4] The five manuscripts of this composition are thus 4Q158 = 4QRP^{a}, 4Q364 = 4QRP^{b}, 4Q365 = 4QRP^{c}, 4Q366 = 4QRP^{d}, and 4Q367 = 4QRP^{e}.

Subsequent to the publication of 4QRP, I have come to realize that this text needs to be reclassified as a biblical manuscript.[5]

The text of 4QRP probably contained the complete Torah, together with some short and long exegetical additions. Lacking is evidence for the first twenty chapters of Genesis,[6] the first ten chapters of Leviticus, Numbers 18–26, and Deuteronomy 21–34. There is no intrinsic reason to believe that any of these segments would have been lacking from 4QRP, although it is not impossible that this would have been the case for the beginning and/or final chapters of the Torah.

The more substantial exegetical additions are listed according to the five different manuscripts of 4QRP, with their fragment numbers:

364 3 ii		Add. + Gen 28:6
364 4b–e ii		Gen 30:26–36 + add.
	365 6a ii and c	Add. + Exod 15:22–26
364 14		?, Exod 19:17?; 24:12–14
364 15		Exod 24:18 + add. + 25:1–2
	365 23	Lev 23:42–24:2 + add.

[1] See E. Tov and S. A. White, *DJD* XIII, 187–352, esp. 192.

[2] J. Allegro published 4Q158 in *DJD* V as "Biblical Paraphrase."

[3] E. Tov, "The Textual Status of 4Q364–367 (4QRP)," in Trebolle, *Madrid Qumran Congres*s, 43–82. See further *DJD* XIII, 190–91.

[4] When the texts were originally assigned to editors in the 1950s, J. Allegro received 4Q158 while 4Q364–367 were allotted to J. Strugnell. Neither scholar realized the close connection between the two texts.

[5] See the end of chapter 20*.

[6] See, however, below on Gen 3:1–2 and 12:4–5.

The rewriting of the contents of the Torah in 4QRP involves the addition and omission of elements, as well as the rearrangement of verses and pericopes, visible in the juxtaposition of the following pericopes. The background of these changes has been discussed elsewhere:[7]

			158 1–2	Gen 32:25–32, Exod 4:27–28
364 14				?, Exod 19:17?; 24:12–14[8]
		367 2a–b		Lev 15:14–15; 19:1–4, 9–15
		367 3		Add.? + Lev 20:13; 27:30–34
	366 2			Lev 24:20–22 (?); 25:39–43
365 28				Num 4:47–49; 7:1
365 36				Num 27:11; 36:1–2
	366 4 i[9]			Num 29:32–30:1; Deut 16:13–14
364 26b, e ii				Deut 9:21?, 25?; 10:1–4

Some juxtapositions of different verses only seemingly differ from the biblical text, as they follow an early textual arrangement that is also reflected in the SP. From these and other cases, it is clear that the text of 4QRP follows the textual tradition of the SP and the Qumran manuscripts related to it. As a result, the sections that are designated in the following instances as reflecting two different biblical books actually reflect their juxtaposition in a single biblical book:

158 7–8	Exod 20:12,16,17; Deut 5:30,31; Exod 20:22–26; 21:1, 3, 4, 6,8,10

This section reflects the context of the Exodus pericope, as in the SP.

158 6	Exod 20:19–22; Deut 5:29; 18:18–20,22

This section likewise reflects the context of the Exodus pericope in the SP.

364 23a–b i	Num 20:17–18; Deut 2:8–14

This section reflects the context of the Deuteronomy pericope, as in the SP.

The main purpose of this short study is to present a synopsis of the content of 4QRP, which has not been included in the *DJD* edition. The synopsis shows clearly the wide coverage of 4QRP, covering all of the Torah, with some exegetical material. It records the content of all five manuscripts of 4QRP, as well as of two fragments possibly belonging to this composition, 4QGen^{h-para} and 4QGen^{k} (see notes 19 and 20). Six further fragments could have belonged to 4QRP or to a similar source:

---

[7] "Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod," in *Renewed Covenant,* 111–34.

[8] This is probably not a juxtaposition of two verses, but rather an exegetical expansion of the text in chapter 24 with elements drawn from chapter 19 among other places.

[9] It is not known at which place in the original manuscript this fragment was located: Numbers, Deuteronomy, or elsewhere. See chapter 20*, n. 95.

1. 2QExod^{b}. The suggestion has been raised that the fragments[10] of this composition[11] reflect a work similar to 4QRP. See below.

2. 4QExod^{d}.[12]

3. 6QDeut?

4. 4QDeut^{k2}, containing segments of chapters 19, 20, 23, 25, and 26.[13]

5. 11QT^{b} XI 21–24 previously described as 11QDeut (Deut 13:7–11) by van der Ploeg,[14] but identified as part of 11QT^{b} by van der Woude[15] and F. García Martínez.[16]

6. 11QLev^{b} (fragments of Leviticus 7–13),[17] described by van der Ploeg as close to 11QT^{b}.[18]

Genesis

4QGen^{k}	Gen **3**:1–2?[19]
4QGen$^{h\text{-para}}$	Gen **12**:4–5[20]
365 1	Gen **21**:9–10
364 1a–b	Gen **25**:18–21

[10] Exod 4:31; 12:26–27 (?); 18:21–22; 19:9; 21:37–22:2, 15–19; 27:17–19; 31:16–17; 34:10.

[11] See Tov, "Biblical Texts" (n. 7 above). The remains of this text are fragmentary, but there are several indications that it is not a regular biblical manuscript. It contains several deviations from the known biblical text (Exod 22:2, 15; 27:17, 18), all of which involve a longer text not preserved elsewhere. Especially interesting is frg. 8 of 2QExod^{b}, in which two lines are found preceding Exod 34:10 that are not known from the context in any of the textual witnesses. The first line reads]וידבר משה ם[, and the second line contains a *vacat*. In *DJD* III, M. Baillet tentatively explained these two lines as representing Exod 19:9. However, it is more likely that this fragment represents a nonbiblical addition before 34:10 similar to the additions in 4QRP. This solution resembles Baillet's naming of this text as a possible *florilège* in *DJD* III, 55. The fact that the Tetragrammaton in 2QExod^{b} is inscribed in paleo-Hebrew and not in the square script may constitute a further argument in favor of the assumption that it does not represent a regular biblical manuscript since most of the manuscripts that present the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters are nonbiblical. See *Scribal Practices*, 238–46.

[12] See chapter 4*.

[13] The scribe of this manuscript wrote the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters in Deut 26:3, as did the scribe of 2QExod^{b} and six other biblical manuscripts.

[14] J. P. M. van der Ploeg, "Les manuscrits de la grotte XI de Qumran," *RevQ* 12 (1985–1987) 3–15, esp. 9–10.

[15] A. S. van der Woude, "Ein bisher unveröffentlichtes Fragment der Tempelrolle," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 89–92.

[16] "11QTemple^{b}. A Preliminary Publication," in Trebolle, *Madrid Qumran Congress,* 363–91, esp. 389. See also *DJD* XXIII, 388.

[17] *DJD* XXIII, 1–7.

[18] Van der Ploeg, "Les manuscrits," 3–15, esp. 10 (see n. 14 above).

[19] In his publication of 4QGen^{k}, frg. 5, J. Davila quotes J. Strugnell who suggests that this fragment actually belongs to 4Q158, and hence to 4QRP. This assumption is based on paleographical considerations, and since the fragment is very small, its provenience cannot be established easily. The text of this fragment deviates slightly from MT. See *DJD* XII, 75.

[20] J. Davila suggests that 4Q8b, written in the same handwriting as the other fragments of 4QGen^{h}, possibly belongs to 4QRP or another rewritten text of Genesis. The text of this small fragment deviates slightly from MT. See *DJD* XII, 62.

364 2		Gen **26**:7–8
364 3 i		Gen **27**:39 or 41
364 3 ii		Add. + Gen **28**:6
364 4a		Gen **29**:32–33?
364 4b, e i		Gen **30**:8–14
364 4b–e ii		Gen **30**:26–36 + add.
364 5a–b i		Gen **31**:47–53
364 6		Gen **32**:18–20
	158 1–2	Gen **32**:25–32 (Exod **4**:27–28)
364 5b ii		Gen **32**:26–30
	158 3	Gen **32**:32
364 7		Gen **34**:2 (?)
364 8 i		Gen **35**:28
364 8 ii		Gen **37**:7–8
364 9a–b		Gen **38**:14–21
364 10		Gen **44**:30–**45**:1
364 11		Gen **45**:21–27
364 12		Gen **48**:14–15 (?)

Exodus

	158 4	Exod **3**:12; 24:4–6
	158 1–2	(Gen **32**:25–32), Exod **4**:27–28
365 2		Exod **8**:13–19
365 3		Exod **9**:9–12
365 4		Exod **10:**19?–20
365 5		Exod **14:**10
365 6a i		Exod **14:**12–21
365 6b		Exod **15:**16–[21]
365 6a ii and c		Add. + Exod **15**:22–26
365 7 i		Exod **17:**3–5
365 7 ii		Exod **18:**13–16
	158 5	Exod **19**:17–23
364 14		?, Exod **19**:17?; **24**:12–14
	158 7–8	Exod **20**:12,16,17 (Deut 5:30,31); Exod **20**:22–26; 21:1,3,4,6,8,10
	158 6	Exod **20**:19–22 (Deut 5:29, 18:18–20,22)
364 13a–b		Exod **21**:14–22
	158 9	Exod **21**:15,16,18,20,22,25
	158 10–12	Exod **21**:32,34,35–37; **22**:1–11,13
366 1		Exod **21**:35–**22**:5
364 14		?, Exod **19**:17?; **24**:12–14
364 15		Exod **24**:18 + add. + **25**:1–2
364 16		Exod **26**:1
364 17		Exod **26**:33–35
365 8a–b		Exod **26:**34–36

	365 9a–b i		Exod **28:**16–20
	365 9b ii		Exod **29:**20–22
		158 13	Exod **30**:32,34
	365 10		Exod **30:**37–**31**:2
	365 11 i		Exod **35:**[2]–5
	365 12a i		Exod **36:**32–38
	365 12a–b ii		Exod **37:**29–**38**:7
	365 12b iii		Exod **39:**1–16
	365 13		Exod **39:**17–19

Leviticus-Numbers[21]

	365 14		Lev **11**:1–[3]
	365 15a–b		Lev **11**:17–[25]
	365 16		Lev **11**:32–[33]
	365 17a–c		Lev **11**:[39]–[46]
		367 1a–b	Lev **11**:47–**13**:1
	365 18		Lev **13**:6–8
	365 19		Lev **13**:15–[19]
	365 20		Lev **13**:51–52
		367 2a–b	Lev **15**:14–15; **19**:1–4, 9–15
	365 21		Lev **16**:6–7 or 11–12 or 17–18
	365 22a–b		Lev **18**:[25]-[29]
		367 3	Add.? + Lev **20**:13; **27**:30–34
	365 23		Lev **23**:42–**24**:2 + add.
	366 2		Lev **24**:20–22 (?); **25**:39–43
	365 24		Lev **25**:7–9
	365 25a–c		Lev **26**:17–32
		367 3	(Add.? + Lev **20**:13); **27**:30–34
	365 26a–b		Lev **27**:34 (?); Num **1:**1–5
	365 27		Num **3**:26–30
	365 28		Num **4**:47–49; **7**:1
	365 29		Num **7**:78–80
	365 30		Num **8**:11–12
	365 31a–c		Num **9**:15–**10**:[4]
	365 32		Num **13**:[11]–25
	365 33a–b		Num **13**:[28]–30
364 18			Num **14**:16–20 + ?
	365 34		Num **15**:26–[29]
	365 35 ii		Num **17**:20–24
	365 36		Num **27**:11; **36**:1–2
	366 3		Num **29**:14–[25]
	366 4 i		Num **29**:32–**30**:1
			(Deut **16**:13–14)
364 19a–b			Num **33**:31–49

[21] These two books are presented together since 4Q365 26a–b probably contains the end of Leviticus together with the beginning of Numbers.

Deuteronomy

364 20a–c			Deut **1**:1–6
364 21a–k			Deut **1**:17–33
364 22			Deut **1**:45–46
	365 37		Deut **2**:24 or 36?
364 23a–b i			(Num **20**:17–18) Deut **2**:8–14
364 24a–c			Deut **2**:30–**3**:2
364 25a–c			Deut **3**:18–23
364 26a i			Deut **9**:6–7
364 26b i			Deut **9**:12–18
364 26a ii			Deut **9**:22–24
364 26c–d			Deut **9**:27–29
364 26b, e ii			Deut **9**:21?, 25?; **10**:1–4
364 27			?, Deut **10**:6–7?
364 28a–b			Deut **10**:10–13
364 29			Deut **10**:22–**11**:2
364 30			Deut **11**:6–9
364 31			Deut **11**:23–24
		366 5	Deut **14**:[13]–21
364 32			Deut **14**:24–26
		366 4 i	(Num **29**:32–**30**:1)
			Deut **16**:13–14[22]
	365 38		Deut **19**:20–**20**:1

The fragments of 4Q364–367 representing different copies of the same text, overlap only twice. 4Q364 17 (Exod 26:33–35) overlaps with 4Q365 8a–b (Exod 26:34–36) and 4Q365 26a–b (Lev 27:34?) overlaps with 4Q367 3 (Lev 27:30–34) in the last verse of Leviticus, 27:34. In the overlapping text, there are also elements in 4Q365 that are not shared with the other textual witnesses of the Bible, but these may have appeared in the lacunae in 4Q367. To these instances we should add the cases of overlapping between 4Q364 and 4Q366, on the one hand, and 4Q158, on the other, viz., 4Q364 5b ii (Gen 32:26–30) = 4Q158 1–2 (Gen 32:25–32; Exod 4:27–28); 4Q364 13a–b (Exod 21:14–22) = 4Q158 9 (Exod 21:15, 16,18,20,22,25); 4Q366 1 (Exod 21:35–22:5) = 4Q158 10–12 (Exod 21:32,34, 35–37; 22:1–11,13). A greater amount of overlap between the five groups of fragments would have been expected; the paucity of such overlaps is probably mere coincidence.

[22] See n. 9.

Chapter Four

Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran

1. Introduction

The production of abbreviated versions, and the excerpting and collecting of different items in anthologies were established phenomena in antiquity,[1] and the existence of such compositions at Qumran is therefore not surprising. That some of the nonbiblical Qumran texts contain anthologies of excerpts was recognized long ago. Most of these texts contain an anthology of biblical texts together with their interpretation. This pertains to 4QFlorilegium (4Q174) and 4QCatena A (4Q177), each containing a collection, which have been reinterpreted by Steudel[2] as reflecting two segments of the same composition, a "thematic pesher" relating to the end of days, and renamed by her as 4QMidrEschat^{a,b}. This composition contains sections from Deuteronomy 33 and 2 Samuel 7, as well as several Psalms, with their interpretation. According to Steudel, other Qumran texts possibly reflecting segments of 4QMidrEschat are 4Q178, 182, and 183. Another group of excerpts is found in a composition named 4QOrdinances, viz., 4Q159 and 4Q513–514 (4QOrd^{a,b,c}), that interprets a series of biblical laws. 11Q13 (11QMelch), another thematic pesher, interprets a series of biblical texts relating to the end of time. 4QTanḥumim (4Q176) likewise contains excerpts from a variety of texts on a common theme, viz., consolation. The combination of excerpts as described above differs from the juxtaposition of *different* literary compositions in the same scroll, sometimes inscribed on the verso and recto, possibly because they belong together, or perhaps due to the scarcity of writing material.[3] Such a collection is found on the two sides of a papyrus containing papPrFêtes^{c} (4Q509), papDibHam^{b} (4Q505), and papPrFêtes^{c} on the recto, papM^{f} (4Q496) and papDibHam^{c} (4Q506) on the verso.[4]

---

[1] For a good summary, see H. Chadwick, "Florilegium," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* VII (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1969) 1131–60. See further the index in T. Birt, *Kritik und Hermeneutik nebst Abriss des Antiken Buchwesens* (Munich: Beck, 1913). For later examples, see the Odes in the Septuagint and the Fragmentary Targumim.

[2] Steudel, *Der Midrasch.*

[3] For a discussion of such opisthographs, see *Scribal Practices*, 68–74.

[4] See M. Baillet, *DJD* VII, 184.

All the above-mentioned excerpted texts reflect the characteristics of the Qumran scribal practice.[5] It is not difficult to find also the ideas of the Qumran covenanters in several of these texts.

The present study is concerned with a further group of excerpted texts, that of biblical texts proper with no accompanying exegesis. The existence of a group of excerpted biblical texts has also been recognized in the past.[6] Our remarks are limited to the Qumran evidence, as no excerpted texts are known from Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Ṣe'elim, Masada, or Murabba'at.

The common denominator of these excerpted texts is that they present large or small segments of the biblical text without accompanying commentaries or reflections on the texts. However, the methods of excerpting differ in the various texts in accordance with their purpose. These texts are of interest at all levels for the biblical scholar, as they relate to the exegesis, literary criticism, liturgy, the development of the canon, and textual criticism, although in the latter case their evidence should be used carefully.

In order to have a better understanding of the group of compositions under investigation, we should first turn our attention to another group of texts that seem close to the excerpted texts, and have indeed been mentioned in the same breath by scholars,[7] viz., rewritten Bible texts (see chapter 6*). However, the two groups of texts are different. Excerpted texts should be regarded as biblical texts, shortened for a special purpose and presented without a commentary, while rewritten Bible texts, whose contents are often very close to what we are used to calling biblical manuscripts, do not pretend to present the text of the Bible. The same characterization probably applies to 2QExod^{b},[8] but its character is unclear due to the fragmentary state of its preservation. Both Stegemann[9] and Brooke[10] refer to 2QExod^{b} as an excerpted text of Exodus, but there is actually no evidence for such a characterization.

Several compositions rewrote the Bible in some way, in varying degrees of closeness to the biblical text. The further removed the text is from MT, the more easily its exegetical character is recognized. The closer the text is to MT, the more difficult it is to define its character. In any event, our concern is not with the rewritten biblical texts, but with the biblical texts proper; more specifically, with excerpted biblical texts. In order to define more precisely the focus of our research, these two types of composition need to be contrasted.

---

[5] *Scribal Practices*, 161–73.

[6] See especially Stegemann, "Weitere Stücke," esp. 217–27; G. Brooke, "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition. Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Merklein et al.; BBB 88; Frankfurt am Main: Anton Hain, 1993) 97–120; Steudel, *Der Midrasch,* 179–81.

[7] Stegemann, "Weitere Stücke," 220 mentioning 2QExod^{b} (see below).

[8] See chapter 3*, n. 11.

[9] Stegemann, "Weitere Stücke," esp. 217–27.

[10] Brooke, "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls," 102 (see n. 6).

Some of the excerpted biblical texts, with which this study is concerned, deviate from the text common to the other manuscripts of the Bible to such an extent that doubts are raised with regard to their status as excerpted biblical manuscripts. It is understood, however, that in early times many of the biblical texts differed greatly from one another. In fact, at that time no two manuscripts were identical and very few were similar. Scribes allowed themselves to make major changes in the text, so major that it is often difficult to distinguish between the last stage in the multi-layered history of the composition of the biblical books and the initial stages of their scribal transmission. As difficult as it may be to understand this situation, no one will doubt that texts diverging from each other as greatly as the MT of Jeremiah on the one hand and the LXX and 4QJer^{b,d} on the other represent the same biblical book. We now know a relatively large group of such widely diverging texts, and the Qumran texts continue to provide further examples of this kind.[11] By the same token, within the wide spectrum of biblical texts there was room for such very divergent orthographic and morphological practices as reflected on the one hand in the proto-Masoretic texts and on the other in such texts as 1QIsa^{a}.[12]

The existence of excerpted texts was first mentioned by Stegemann, who listed some in his 1967 study focusing on 4QDeut^{n} (see n. 6). We are now able to identify a much larger group of excerpted texts that are recognized by different criteria. Each excerpted text is of a different nature, and because of its fragmentary state of preservation, the nature of several texts is not clear. Nor is it clear what the *Sitz im Leben* was of some of these compositions. The largest group of excerpted texts was probably prepared for liturgical purposes, and, just like lectionaries in ancient and modern times, they contain excerpts from biblical texts prepared for devotional purposes. Others were made for exegetical-ideological (4QTest) and literary purposes. Excerpted texts are recognized by the juxtaposition of different biblical texts, either from different books or from the same book. All collections of excerpts are written in scrolls of small dimensions, and sometimes their limited scope is the main criterion for assuming the existence of an excerpted text.[13] In the following list, excerpted texts are mentioned together with abbreviated texts (for the distinction, see below, § 4).

2. List

a. 4QTestimonia (4Q175). This text constitutes the clearest example of a small anthology, containing three texts from the Torah (Exod 20:21 according to the SP;

[11] For a discussion, see *TCHB*, 313–50.

[12] See *Scribal Practices*, 261–73.

[13] Stegemann, "Weitere Stücke," 218 also invokes the use of certain types of handwriting for the recognition of excerpted texts. This criterion is problematic.

Num 24:15–17; Deut 33:8–11),[14] with a fourth one quoting from an extra-biblical composition, 4QapocrJoshua[b] (4Q379).[15] The common theme of these texts is probably the Messiah. The four pericopes are written in separate paragraphs, the last lines of which have been left empty following the last word; each new pericope is indicated with a curved *paragraphos* sign denoting a new section.[16]

b. *Tefillin* and *mezuzot*.[17] Each phylactery contains a selection of four different sections from Exodus and Deuteronomy, indicating its liturgical character. Some of them reflect the sections prescribed in rabbinic sources: *b. Menaḥ.* 34a–37b, 42b–43b (especially 34b) and *Massekhet Tefillin* 9 (see Higger, *Minor Treatises*), namely, Exod 13:1–10, 13:11–16; Deut 6:4–9, 11:13–21 (italicized in Tables 1 and 2). Other *tefillin* reflect a wider range, including additional sections from Exodus 12 and Deuteronomy 5, 6, 10, 11, and 32. The range of these selections and their orthographical and morphological systems are discussed elsewhere.[18] The *tefillin* and *mezuzot* thus contain excerpts from the Torah, separated by a *vacat* in the middle of the line or a blank line. Since no comments are added, these are truly excerpted texts. The range of variation in these texts reflects the known variants between biblical manuscripts, and is not specific to these excerpted texts. On the other hand, the scribal practices used in the writing of these texts differ from the writing of the biblical texts.[19] The following sections are included in the *tefillin*, displayed here in two tables showing adherence or non-adherence to Qumran scribal practices:[20]

---

[14] The nature of the first excerpt creates a somewhat unusual impression as it seems to quote from two pericopes in Deuteronomy (Deut 5:28–29, 18:18–19), but in fact it contains merely one text which, as in SP (Exod 20:21), is composed of two pericopes that occur in different places in MT. For the same juxtaposition of texts, see 4Q158 (4QRP[a]), frg. 6.

[15] Publication: C. Newsom, *DJD* XXII.

[16] A very similar sign separates the sections in Greek excerpted texts; see P.Tebt. I 1–2 and P.Petrie I,3. See *Scribal Practices*, 182, 361.

[17] The main group of *tefillin* was published by J.T. Milik in *DJD* VI; for a preliminary publication of four *tefillin,* see K.G. Kuhn, "Phylakterien aus Höhle 4 von Qumran" (AHAW, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1957,1). A second group was published by Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran (XQ Phyl 1–4)* (Jerusalem 1969) = *ErIsr* 9 (1969) 60–85. Corrections for the latter are provided by M. Baillet, "Nouveaux phylactères de Qumran (XQ Phyl 1–4) à propos d'une édition récente," *RevQ* 7 (1970) 403–15. See further 1Q13 and 8Q3. 5QPhyl (5Q8) has not been opened. M. Morgenstern and M. Segal, *DJD* XXXVIII published two *tefillin* from Naḥal Ḥever/Wadi Seiyal. See the analysis of these texts in *Scribal Practices,* 256–8, 270–71.

[18] *Scribal Practices,* 270–71.

[19] See *Scribal Practices,* 270–71 and D. Rothstein, *From Bible to Murabbaʿat: Studies in the Literary, Scribal and Textual Features of Phylacteries and Mezuzot in Ancient Israel and Early Judaism,* unpubl. Ph.D. diss., University of California, 1992.

[20] The following abbreviations are used: (a)rm, (h)ead.

Table 1: Contents of Tefillin *from Cave 4 Written in the Qumran Scribal Practice*

Tefillin	Deut	Deut	Deut	Exod
A (a)	5:1–14; 5:27–6:3	10:12–11:12, *13–21*		12:43–51, *13:1–7*
B (a)	5:1–6:3, *4–5*			*13:9–16*
G (h)	5:1–21			*13:11–12*
H (h)	5:22–6:3, *4–5*			*13:14–16*
I (h)	*6:6–7* (?)	*11:13–21*		12:43–51, *13:1–10*
J (h)	5:1–32; 6:2–3			
K (h)		10:12–11:12		
L (h)	5:7–24			
M (h)	5:33–6:3, *4–5*			12:44–51, *13:1–10*
N (h)			32:14–20, 32–33	
O	5:1–16; *6:7–9*			
P		10:22–11:3, *18–21*		
Q		11:4–12, *13–18*		13:4–9

Table 2: Contents of Tefillin *from Cave 4 Not Written in the Qumran Scribal Practice*

Tefillin	Exod	Deut	Deut
C (a)	*13:1–16*	*6:4–9*	*11:13–21*
D (h) ?			*11:13–21*
E (h) ?	*13:1–9*		
F (h)	*13:11–16*		
R	*13:1–10*		
S			*11:19–21*

The *mezuzot* are more fragmentary than the *tefillin*. They contain sections from either a single text (Exodus 20, Deuteronomy 6, 11, or 13) or from two texts: Deuteronomy 6, 10–11 (4QMez B) and Deuteronomy 5–6, 10 (4QMez C).

c. 4QDeut^{j}. According to Duncan in *DJD* XIV, 4QDeut^{j} contains segments of both Exodus (12:43 ff.; 13:1–5) and Deuteronomy (chapters 5, 6, 8, 11, 30 [?], 32). The script of the fragments of Exodus and Deuteronomy is identical, as are the leather, the pattern of deterioration of the fragments and the column length of 14 lines,[21] and Duncan therefore considers these fragments to have derived from a single scroll containing segments of both biblical books. Although no frag-

[21] The length of frg. 8, for which 11 lines are reconstructed by Duncan, is exceptional, and should be further investigated.

ment has been preserved containing a join of Exodus and Deuteronomy,[22] the possibility raised by Duncan[23] is very attractive, and is confirmed by the photographs. That this text, probably written in the Qumran practice, indeed contains excerpts which served liturgical purposes is supported by two considerations: this manuscript consist of sections that are also contained in the Qumran *tefillin* recorded in Table 1,[24] and the manuscript is of small dimensions (14 lines), on which see below.

d. 4QDeut^{n}. This enigmatic text contains six columns of small dimensions written on two sheets. The first sheet, originally attached to the second one,[25] did not contain the beginning of the scroll since it displays sewn edges at its right margin. The first sheet contains the text of Deut 8:5–10, while the second sheet contains Deut 5:1–6:1 in five columns. The first sheet consists of a single, wide column (7 lines of 40–65 letter-spaces), while the next five columns contain 12 lines of 30–50 letter-spaces. The text of the Decalogue is that of Deuteronomy,[26] but in the fourth commandment it adds the text of Exod 20:11 after Deut 5:15, as in 4QPhyl G, 8QPhyl, 4QMez A and Pap Nash. White[27] elaborates on an earlier view expressed by Stegemann[28] that this scroll is not a regular biblical scroll, but rather contains excerpts from Deuteronomy. Another view, not necessarily in contradiction to this assumption, has been suggested by Weinfeld[29] and Eshel.[30] According to this view, 4QDeut^{n} should be regarded as a liturgical or devotional text, since its second sheet contains a section used in several Qumran *tefillin*[31]

---

[22] יהוה on the first line of frg. 11, recorded as line 11 of that fragment, is listed by Duncan as "Deut 11:21?" and is followed by three lines from Exod 12:43. However, that word can also be read as לן יהוה which is found in the immediately preceding context in Exodus. The join tentatively suggested by Duncan on the basis of this single word is therefore not certain.

[23] J. A. Duncan, "Considerations of 4QDt^{j} in Light of the 'All Souls Deuteronomy' and Cave 4 Phylactery Texts," in *Madrid Qumran Congress,* 199–215 and plates 2–7.

[24] In two *tefillin* (4QPhyl A, I), Deut 11:13–21 is followed directly by Exod 12:43. An exception should be made for the fragment of 4QDeut^{j} containing Deuteronomy 8, which is not contained in the *tefillin*. That chapter, however, is also contained in 4QDeut^{n}, which for other reasons is also regarded as a liturgical text. A second exception is made by Duncan for the inclusion in 4QDeut^{j} of Deut 30:17–18, but she is not certain about the identification.

[25] Thus Stegemann, "Weitere Stücke," 222, who inspected the scroll before its two sheets were disconnected.

[26] On the text of this scroll, see especially E. Eshel, "4QDeut^{n} – A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991) 117–54.

[27] S. A. White, "4QDt^{n}: Biblical Manuscript or Excerpted Text?," in *Of Scribes and Scrolls,* 13–20; eadem, "The All Souls Deuteronomy and the Decalogue," *JBL* 109 (1991) 193–206.

[28] Stegemann, "Weitere Stücke."

[29] M. Weinfeld, "Prayer and Liturgical Practice in Qumran," in *The Scrolls of the Judaean Desert, Forty Years of Research* (ed. M. Broshi et al.; Heb.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1992) 160–75.

[30] Eshel, "4QDeut^{n}," esp. 148–52 (see n. 26).

[31] 4QPhyl A, B, G, H, J, L, M, O.

(5:1–6:1) and the first sheet contains 8:5–10, a section that serves as the basis for the blessing after the meals.[32]

e. 4QDeut^{q} (Deut 32:37–43).[33] This is a scroll of small dimensions, probably containing only the poem in Deuteronomy 32 (one column of 11 lines of 21 letter-spaces and a final column of 11 lines of 14–15 letter-spaces). The empty space to the left of the last verses of chapter 32 shows that this is the last column of the scroll, though not of the book. This scroll does not contain a shorter text of Deuteronomy, but rather a selection from Deuteronomy, or of poems of sundry nature, or perhaps this song only. The scroll is probably of very limited scope, like all copies of the Five Scrolls,[34] and like 4QPs^{g}. Note that 4QPhyl N also contained Deuteronomy 32.

f. 4QPs^{g,h} and 5QPs, all containing Psalm 119. Probably the first two scrolls, and possibly also the third one,[35] contained only that psalm. 4QPs^{g} is of small dimensions (9 lines), a fact that supports the assumption that the scroll contains only this psalm, which had a special status among the early texts of Psalms, since it was consistently written stichometrically in the various texts.[36]

g. 4QExod^{d}. This scroll, covering Exod 13:15–16 and 15:1, omits a major section of Exodus following the laws of the Mazzot festival ending at 13:16. The narrative section of 13:17–22 and all of chapter 14 are omitted and it recommences in 15:1 with the Song at the Sea. In her edition of the text in *DJD* XII, Sanderson suggests that it constitutes a fragment of a liturgical scroll.[37]

h. 4QDeut^{k1}.[38] The scroll, written in the Qumran scribal practice, contains sections of Deuteronomy 5, 11, and 32,[39] all of which are also contained in the *tefillin* written in the Qumran scribal practice (Table 1). While the survival of these particular passages of Deuteronomy may be a matter of coincidence, the suggestion has been made that the choice of these passages reflects a certain reality. As with 4QDeut^{j,n}, this scroll could have contained a collection of liturgical texts.

---

[32] According to a further view, by J. Strugnell, quoted and discussed by White, "4QDt^{n}" (1990), the first sheet constituted a correction sheet that was incorrectly sewn to the right of what now constitutes the second sheet.

[33] Publication: P. W. Skehan and E. Ulrich, *DJD* XIV. See the analysis by P.-M. Bogaert, "Les trois rédactions conservées et la forme originale de l'envoi du Cantique de Moïse (Dt 32,43)," in *Das Deuteronomium, Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft* (ed. N. Lohfink; BETL 68; Leuven: University Press, 1985) 329–40. For earlier discussions, see especially E. S. Artom, "Sul testo di Deuteronomio XXXII, 37–43," *RSO* 32 (1957) 285–91; R. Meyer, "Die Bedeutung von Deuteronomium 32,8 f. 43 (4Q) für die Auslegung des Mosesliedes," in *Verbannung und Heimkehr, Beiträge … W. Rudolph zum 70. Geburtstage* (ed. A. Kuschke; Tübingen: Mohr, 1961) 197–209.

[34] See *Scribal Practices*, 98.

[35] Thus Milik, *DJD* III, 174.

[36] Thus 1QPs^{a}, 4QPs^{g}, 4QPs^{h}, 5QPs, 11QPs^{a}.

[37] Ibid., p. 127.

[38] See J. Duncan in *DJD* XIV.

[39] No fragments from other chapters have been preserved.

i. 4QCant[a] and 4QCant[b].[40] These scrolls contain two different shortened versions of Canticles, following the order of the text in the other biblical witnesses, thus abbreviating it in the same way as 4QExod[d]. The background of the abbreviating differed, however. While the texts of Exodus, Deuteronomy, and Psalms probably presented liturgical anthologies, the Canticles texts contain abbreviated versions of an undetermined nature, probably reflecting the excerptors' literary taste.

These texts contain the following sections:

4QCant[a]	col. i	3:4–5
	col. ii	3:7–4:6
	col. iii	4:7, 6:11?–7:7
4QCant[b]	frg. 1	2:9–3:2
	frg. 2 i	3:[2]–5, 9–11, [4:1a]
	frg. 2 ii	4:1b–3, 8–11a
	frg. 3	4:[11b]–5:1

Both 4QCant[a] and 4QCant[b] lack substantial segments of text found in the other textual witnesses (one segment in 4QCant[a] iii: Cant 4:7 until 6:11; two segments in 4QCant[b], viz., Cant 3:6–8 in 4QCant[b] 2 i; and Cant 4:4–7 in 4QCant[b] 2 ii). The shorter text of the two scrolls vis-à-vis the other witnesses is thus a well-supported feature. Where the two texts overlap, they are shorter in different places. Part of the section which is lacking in 4QCant[a] iii between Cant 4:8 and 6:11 is extant in 4QCant[b] 2 ii and 3; likewise, the section lacking in 4QCant[b] 2 i, viz., Cant 3:6–8, is partially represented in 4QCant[a] ii, and the section lacking in 4QCant[b] 2 ii, viz., Cant 4:4–7, is represented in 4QCant[a] iii. In chapter 4, different sections are thus lacking in 4QCant[a] and 4QCant[b], and to some extent the two scrolls supplement each other. The shorter text of the two scrolls was created consciously by the scribes or their predecessors by shortening the content of the biblical book was evidently not a matter of scribal negligence (in one case, in 4QCant[b], the omission is very large and would have filled several columns in this scroll of small dimensions). The assumption that scribal negligence is not involved is based on the fact that complete literary units are missing in the three instances of a shorter text in the two different manuscripts. The two texts undoubtedly present manuscripts of Canticles rather than commentaries or paraphrases, but they constitute biblical manuscripts of a special kind. With some hesitation, they are described here as abbreviated texts, although there are no exact parallels for this assumption among other Qumran texts. 4QExod[d] probably formed another such abbreviated text. Further parallels are excerpted biblical texts that juxtapose segments of the Bible according to considerations of content, such as described in this study. The reference to abbreviating may seem somewhat exaggerated for the few instances of text shortening, but the result of this abbreviating is that

[40] Publication: E. Tov, *DJD* XVI, 195–219.

the text of 4QCant[a] is much shorter than the other witnesses. 4QCant[b] is only slightly shorter, but if that text terminated at 5:1, as suggested in *DJD* XVI, 217, it presented only the first half of the biblical book. Attention is also drawn to the scribal signs in 4QCant[b] (letters in the paleo-Hebrew script and some cryptic signs) and the remnants of a superscription in the top margin of frg. 1 of the same manuscript, all of which may have been related to the special character of these manuscripts. The biblical book of Canticles contains a conglomeration of love songs rather than one coherent composition, and therefore segments could be removed from it without harming the context. This is the case with the two Qumran scrolls, each of which has been shortened in a different way and follows the sequence of the text as extant in the other textual witnesses. Underlying this description, thus, is the understanding that the Qumran scrolls shortened an already existing text, while the assumption that they represented early literary crystallizations of the book differing from that represented by the other textual witnesses, though not impossible, is discarded.

That the omissions in these manuscripts, as compared with the other textual witnesses, do not reflect scribal negligence is clear from 4QCant[b] 2 iii 6–7 where the omission of Cant 4:4–7 is indicated by an open paragraph after v 3 at the end of line 6, and a large indentation at the beginning of the next line, before the text of v 8. Likewise, at the point where 4QCant[a] ii 1–2 omits a large section, Cant 4:8–6:10, a partial and a complete empty line were probably found in the reconstructed text. Furthermore, the last verse of the omitted section 4:4–7, Cant 4:7, forms the end of a content unit, which is indicated in MT with a closed paragraph, and the next verse in the scroll, Cant 6:11, begins another unit, indicated in MT with a closed paragraph after 6:10.

j. Many of the Qumran psalms texts reflect a special type of excerpted text, prepared for liturgical purposes. The question of whether several of the psalm scrolls from Qumran reflect a biblical text, parallel to MT but deviating from it, or anthologies prepared for a liturgical purpose has preoccupied scholars for some time. This question first arose with the publication of 11QPs[a].[41] That scroll probably should have been given a more neutral name, since, as it stands, it is taken as a reflection of the biblical book of Psalms. The discussion of the nature of this scroll has been revived with the publication of the psalms scrolls from cave 4. The issue at stake is an evaluation of the sequence of the psalms in 11QPs[a], which differs from MT, in conjunction with the addition of extra-canonical psalms, at various places in the collection. Sanders, who published 11QPs[a], suggested that this scroll constitutes an early crystallization of the biblical book of Psalms.[42] That

[41] J. A. Sanders, *DJD* IV.

[42] See idem, "Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QPs[a])," *HTR* 59 (1966) 83–94; "Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon," *McCQ* 21 (1968) 1–15; *"The Qumran Scroll* (11QPs[a]) Reviewed," in *On Language, Culture, and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida* (ed. M. Black and W. A. Smalley; The Hague: Mouton, 1974) 79–99.

literary form existed alongside another edition of the Psalms, MT, and possibly other editions, such as several texts from cave 4 that were not yet known to Sanders. Talmon, Goshen-Gottstein, Skehan, and Haran all argued against this view and considered the Psalms Scroll from cave 11 irrelevant to the issue of canon, since according to them it constituted a liturgical collection.[43] Wacholder also disagreed with Sanders but turned in a different direction when suggesting that the scroll reflects a Davidic collection (cf. col. XXVII) intended for use in serving David at the end of days.[44] In the wake of the finding of additional collections of Psalters, some scholars have now returned to Sanders' views. At least seven collections of psalms from caves 4 and 11 display them in a sequence different from that in MT, sometimes with the addition of non-canonical psalms: (1) 11QPs^{a}, also reflected in 4QPs^{e} and 11QPs^{b} and probably also in 4QPs^{b}; (2) 4QPs^{a}; (3) 4QPs^{d}; (4) 4QPs^{f}; (5) 4QPs^{k}; (6) 4QPs^{n}; (7) 4QPs^{q}.[45] Wilson tabulated the agreements and disagreements among the various collections of psalms.[46] Flint showed that most of the differences pertained to the last two books of the Psalter (Psalms 90–150), while realizing that it is difficult to evaluate the evidence since the second part of the book of Psalms has been better preserved at Qumran than the first part.[47] Like Sanders and Wilson, Flint concluded that the first part of the collection of psalms was finalized before the second part, and that the major differences among the various collections of psalms from Qumran reflect different crystallizations of the biblical book. Furthermore, according to Flint, there is no evidence at Qumran of any scroll clearly supporting the Masoretic Psalter, an assumption that, incidentally, is supported by the Masoretic shape of MasPs^{a,b}. In any event, whatever their background, we now know of several additional collections beyond the Masoretic collection from Qumran that are characterized by the addition and omission of Psalms and by different sequencing.[48] Because of the fragmentary preservation of the texts, it is often not known whether the

[43] S. Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emṣa' Pasuq and 11QPs^{a}," *Textus* 5 (1966) 11–21; M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^{a}): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966) 22–33; P. W. Skehan, "A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs^{a}," *CBQ* 35 (1973) 195–205; M. Haran, "11QPs^{a} and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minhah le-Nahum – Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (ed. M. Brettler and M. Fishbane; JSOTSup154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 193–201.

[44] B. Z. Wacholder, "David's Eschatological Psalter – 11QPsalms^{a}," *HUCA* 59 (1988) 23–72.

[45] This list needs to be compared with the analyses in Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls* and U. Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum – Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle* 11QPs^{a} *aus Qumran* (STDJ 2003; Leiden/Boston: 2003). Possibly 11QapocrPs (11Q11) needs to be included in this list.

[46] G. H. Wilson, "The Qumran Psalms Manuscripts and the Consecutive Arrangement of Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter," *CBQ* 45 (1983) 377–88; idem, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBLDS 76; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985).

[47] P. W. Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*.

[48] Examples culled from the list provided by Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls, 52*: 4QPs^{a} and 4QPs^{q} omit Psalm 32, and the former reflects the following sequence: 38, 71; 4QPs^{d} has the following sequence: 147, 104, while 4QPs^{e} has the sequences 118, 104 and 105, 146.

evidence of any two groups of fragments pertains to two different scrolls or a single one. In one group only (1) can it be demonstrated that three or four different manuscripts reflect the same collection.

If the view suggested by Sanders, Wilson, and Flint is upheld, it implies that the psalms fragments from caves 4 and 11 probably constitute the group of Qumran evidence that diverges most from MT. However, the arguments adduced in favor of the assumption that 11QPs[a] reflects a liturgical collection also hold with regard to the texts from cave 4,[49] and this view seems preferable to us. External evidence supporting this claim is found in the small dimensions of 4QPs[g], which usually indicate the limited scope of a scroll.

k. 4QEzek[a]. This scroll has been cautiously described by G. J. Brooke as an excerpted text.[50] The principle involved is the same as that described for 4QDeut[k1] (above, h) as an excerpted text on the basis of its fragmentary remains, which have been described as agreeing with the passages included in certain *tefillin*. While the survival of these particular passages in Deuteronomy may be coincidental, the suggestion has been made that the choice of these passages reflects a certain reality. By the same token, Brooke suggests that the survival of the 4QEzek[a] fragments is not a matter of coincidence, but reflects a selection of topics that were also quoted several times in the literary cycle of reworked versions of the book of Ezekiel: Ezek 10:5–15, 10:17–11:11 (both: the vision of the city's destruction), 23:14–18, 44–47 (adultery of Samaria and Jerusalem), and 41:3–6 (the temple).

The preceding list shows that the excerpted texts were often inscribed in scrolls of limited size (4QTestimonia, *tefillin* and *mezuzot,* 4QDeut[n], 4QDeut[q], 4QPs[g] and 4QCant[a,b]). This custom must have developed in response to the same need that prompted the making of excerpts. In his discussion of excerpting in classical antiquity, Birt notes that some texts were excerpted in order to create smaller editions that could be more easily carried by travelers.[51] In the case of the Qumran scrolls, it was probably their liturgical character that dictated the small, and hence more practical, dimensions of the scrolls.

On the basis of this evidence, we now turn to three additional scrolls whose small size may indicate that they are collections of excerpted texts. The reasoning behind this argument is that in all these instances it is difficult to imagine how the complete biblical book could have been contained in a scroll of such limited

---

[49] 11QPs[a] contains prose as well as poetry sections showing the purpose of the collection (focus on David). To one of the psalms (145), the scroll has added liturgical antiphonal additions. The writing of the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters in this text may indicate that the scribe considered this to be a nonbiblical text. To these arguments, Talmon added the fact that 11QPs[a], unlike MasPs[b] and other biblical manuscripts, does not present the texts in a stichometric arrangement, which was reserved for the biblical texts. See S. Talmon, *Minhah le-Nahum* (see n. 43) 318–27, esp. 324.

[50] "Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts," in *Madrid Qumran Congress,* I.317–37, esp. 319.

[51] Birt, *Kritik und Hermeneutik,* 349 (see n. 1 above)

dimensions. Besides, it is probably worthwhile to point to a parallel in *b. B. Bat.* 14a, according to which the size of the columns should be commensurate with the size of the scroll.

l. 4QExod^{e} containing 8 lines of 30–34 letter-spaces and a preserved top and bottom margin (Exod 13:3–5). In her *DJD* edition, Sanderson writes about this text: "Since the column begins at the beginning of one section of instructions for the observance of the feast of unleavened bread, it may be that this was a manuscript for liturgical purposes consisting of selections from the Torah."[52]

m. 5QDeut (segments of chapters 5, 8) with 15 lines of 86 letter-spaces.

n. 4QPs^{b} (Psalms 91–94, 99–100, 102–103–112–113, 116–117–118) with 16 and 18 lines of 14.0 cm.[53]

o. According to Lange, the columns of 4QIsa^{d} were too short in order to contain all of Isaiah. This scroll either contained only deutero-Isaiah or was an excerpted scroll.[54]

3. Excerpted or Abbreviated Texts?

Due to the fragmentary status of our evidence, excerpted texts are listed together with abbreviated texts, but they form two different, though similar, groups of texts. Most of the texts mentioned here present excerpts from one or several biblical books (Exodus, Deuteronomy, or combinations from those books; Psalms), without paying attention to the sequence of the excerpts in the biblical witnesses. In three or possibly four cases, however, it is evident that the composition abbreviated the biblical book according to the sequence of the chapters in the other textual witnesses, viz., 4QExod^{d}, 4QCant^{a}, 4QCant^{b}, and possibly also 4QEzek^{a}. In several other cases, it is not known whether the composition presents an excerpted or abbreviated text.

4. Background

Although the evidence for excerpting is limited, a few general considerations are in order. Some of the excerpts from the Bible are little more than quotes (4QTestimonia and the *tefillin*), while the psalms scrolls contain anthologies of texts used for a special purpose. This pertains also to all the excerpted texts that are not composed of biblical texts, such as the aforementioned 4QMidrEschat^{a,b}, 4QOrd^{a,b,c}, 11QMelch, and 4QTanḥ.

---

[52] *DJD* XII, 130.

[53] Cf. P. W. Skehan, "Qumran Manuscripts," 154: "Considering the short, narrow columns with ample spacing between, it is most unlikely that 4Q Ps^{b} ever contained the entire Psalter."

[54] A. Lange, review of *DJD* XV in *DSD* 8 (2001) 101–102.

Types of excerpting/abbreviating
The excerpts of biblical texts reflect different types of excerpting and abbreviating.

a. *Different sections from two books of the Torah*
4QTestimonia (4Q175)
Tefillin and *mezuzot*
4QDeut^{j}.

b. *Different sections from the same book*
4QExod^{d}, 4QExod^{e}
4QDeut^{k1}
4QDeut^{n} (sequence differing from MT)
4QDeut^{q} (nature of the selection is not clear)
5QDeut (probably)
All or most of the Psalms texts
4QCant^{a} and 4QCant^{b}.
4QExod^{d}, 4QPs^{n}, 4QCant^{a,b} probably present abbreviated versions.

Purpose of excerpting/abbreviating
Excerpts and abbreviated versions were prepared for different purposes. Most classical excerpted texts in poetry and prose were made for educational purposes, illustrating a certain topic or idea (virtues, wealth, women, etc.).[55] Most of the excerpted texts from Qumran, on the other hand, appear to have been liturgical.

Liturgical collection
Tefillin and *mezuzot*
4QExod^{d} covering Exod 13:15–16 and 15:1
4QExod^{e} containing Exod 13:3–5
4QDeut^{j} containing Exod 12:43 ff., 13:1–5, and fragments of Deuteronomy 5, 6, 8, 11, 30[?], and 32
4QDeut^{k1} containing segments of Deuteronomy 5, 11, and 32
4QDeut^{n} containing Deut 8:5–10; 5:1–6:1
5QDeut containing segments of Deuteronomy 5 and 8
All the anthologies of the Psalter from caves 4 and 11.

Within this group, the nature of the excerpts differs from case to case. While the *tefillin* and *mezuzot* contain limited Scripture segments, the psalms texts contain

[55] See the material collected by Chadwick (n. 1). Good examples are provided by P.Hibeh 7 (3d century BCE), P.Petrie I,3, and P.Tebt. I,1–2 (100 BCE). See further the much later Greek collection of pericopes (P.Ryl. Gk. 260) from Isaiah, Genesis, Chronicles, and Deuteronomy (4th century CE) published by C. H. Roberts, *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester* (Manchester: University Press, 1936) 47–62.

sizeable anthologies, probably meant for devotional reading in private or public. These anthologies closely resemble the Greek lectionaries of the Old and New Testaments. In the manuscripts, the selections were at first indicated by notes in the margin, or sometimes in the text itself, indicating the beginning (ἀρχή) and end (τελός), and at a later stage they were collected in special anthologies.[56]

Personal reading
Some texts may reflect copies made for personal use.

4QDeut^{q}, containing segments of the poem in Deuteronomy 32, may have contained segments of different books or songs, or only that poem.

The scrolls containing Psalm 119 (4QPs^{g,h} and 5QPs) could have been liturgical texts or scrolls made for personal use.

4QCant^{a} and 4QCant^{b} contain abbreviated versions of several chapters. It is not impossible that the scribal signs in 4QCant^{b} and the remnants of a superscription in frg. 1 of the same manuscript were related to the special character of these manuscripts.

4QEzek^{a} (possibly).

Exegetical-ideological anthology
4QTestimonia (4Q175)

5. Textual Character

For the textual analysis of the Bible, the excerpted or abbreviated texts provide the same type of evidence as running biblical texts, with the exception that the lack of pericopes should be ascribed to excerpting or shortening, and not to the special textual character of the scroll.

Probably the most striking feature of the excerpted and abbreviated texts is that, with the exception of some of the *tefillin* and *mezuzot* (Table 2), none of the collections is close to MT. This indicates that these texts come from a certain milieu, one that differed from the circles fostering the tradition of the writing of Scripture texts. Since the majority of the biblical texts found at Qumran reflect MT (see chapter 10*, § 4B), the small number of excerpted and abbreviated texts written in the Masoretic textual tradition is all the more significant. The texts written in the Masoretic scribal tradition probably reflect the precise tradition of writing Scripture texts fostered by rabbinic circles. At the same time, a special group of excerpts was written in the same tradition, namely some of the *tefillin* and *mezuzot* (Table 2 above) that would have come from the same circles.

[56] See B. M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible – An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981) 43.

On the other hand, the excerpted and abbreviated texts reflect a free manipulation of the biblical text, both in Qumran and other, probably non-rabbinic, circles involving literary freedom with regard to the biblical texts. These texts reflect a different approach to the Bible, and they reflect textual traditions beyond that of MT. In this context, it is relevant to note that several of the excerpted texts are written in the Qumran scribal practice:

4QDeut^{j} (no solid evidence), 4QDeut^{k}
4QTestimonia (4Q175)
Several of the *tefillin* and *mezuzot* (Table 1)
Two anthologies of Psalms: 11QPs^{a} and 11QPs^{b}.

As for the textual character of these texts, 4QDeut^{q} has close affinities to the LXX. Harmonizing tendencies are visible in several of the *tefillin*[57] and in 4QDeut^{n} involving the addition of words and verses from parallel pericopes, especially in the case of the two versions of the Decalogue. Several of the texts reflect a free approach to Scripture, which may indicate that they were prepared for personal use. Thus, one of the two copies of Canticles, 4QCant^{b}, contains a high percentage of scribal errors and its scribe was much influenced by Aramaic.

[57] 4QMez A, 4QPhyl G, and 8QPhyl as described by E. Eshel (n. 26 above).

Chapter Five

The Text of Isaiah at Qumran

1. Number of Copies

The Qumran caves yielded no less than twenty-one copies of the book of Isaiah.[1] Other books represented at Qumran in large numbers are Deuteronomy, of which twenty-six copies are known,[2] and Psalms with thirty-six copies.[3] The reason for the large number of copies of these books was probably their popularity among the Qumran covenanters. A close affinity with these three books is also manifest in the writings of the Qumranites.[4] The popularity of these books at Qumran does not imply that all the copies of Isaiah were produced there. Some were written at Qumran, while others were produced elsewhere in Palestine and brought to Qumran. It is important to remember this assumption, since the information about the textual condition and transmission of Isaiah visible in the Qumran scrolls probably reflects the condition of that book in ancient Israel as a whole, and not only at Qumran.

---

[1] The number of copies of biblical books found at Qumran should always be considered conjectural. Most of the fragments are small, containing no more than one-tenth of a biblical book. The script of the texts serves as the main criterion for distinguishing between the supposedly different copies even when only tiny fragments have been preserved. Therefore, one has to be cautious when estimating the number of scrolls on the basis of small fragments. For example, if a scroll of Isaiah was written by more than one scribe, any two fragments of that book written in different scripts could have belonged to that scroll. See further chapter 10*, § 1. At present, twenty-one copies are identified while at an earlier stage, P. W. Skehan ("Qumran Manuscripts," 150) mentioned sixteen copies, of which thirteen were from cave 4, and in 1979 ("Qumran, Littérature de Qumran," esp. 810) he mentioned eighteen copies.

[2] See F. García Martínez, "Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda et le Deutéronome," in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994) 63–82.

[3] See P. W. Flint, "The Psalms Scrolls from the Judaean Desert: Relationships and Textual Affiliations," in Brooke–García Martínez, *New Qumran Texts,* 31–52, esp. 51–2.

[4] The Qumranites wrote several prose compositions in the style of Deuteronomy as well as poetical books influenced by the biblical book of Psalms. Likewise, the writings of the Qumran community often quote from Isaiah, which held a unique place in their thinking. All three books were often quoted in the sectarian writings from Qumran. For 1QH^a, see P. Wernberg-Møller, "The Contribution of the *Hodayot* to Biblical Textual Criticism," *Textus* 4 (1964) 133–75, esp. 173–5; O. J. R. Schwarz, *Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament* (Diest: Lichtland, 1965).

The following copies of Isaiah were found at Qumran:[5]

1QIsa[a][6]	4QIsa[j]
1QIsa[b][7]	4QIsa[k]
4QIsa[a][8]	4QIsa[l]
4QIsa[b]	4QIsa[m]
4QIsa[c][9]	4QIsa[n]
4QIsa[d]	4QIsa[o]
4QIsa[e]	4QpapIsa[p][10]
4QIsa[f]	4QIsa[q]
4QIsa[g]	4QIsa[r]
4QIsa[h]	5QIsa
4QIsa[i]	

No copies of Isaiah were found at Masada, and a single copy only was among the fragments found at Wadi Murabba'at, viz. Mur 3 (MurIsaiah).[11] By far the greatest number of copies of Isaiah thus comes from cave 4, although the only complete copy of Isaiah, probably stored in a jar, was found in cave 1. Due to the better storage conditions, the two copies from cave 1 provide a greater coverage of the text of Isaiah than the eighteen (sometimes very) fragmentary texts from cave 4. Research on the text of Isaiah at Qumran is still very much eclipsed by 1QIsa[a], but the time has arrived to review the picture relating to all the fragments. While it is true that the two texts from cave 1 provide a complete scroll (1QIsa[a]) and one that is well preserved (1QIsa[b]), there is also one among the cave 4 texts that covers substantial sections, including both the beginning and end of the book (4QIsa[b]), and another that is relatively well preserved (4QIsa[c]).

---

[5] See especially *DJD* XV. For an earlier detailed catalog of the contents of all the Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah, see Skehan, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran," 811–2. For a short study on the text of Isaiah in Qumran, see F. García Martínez, "Le livre d'Isaïe à Qumran," *MdB* 49 (1987) 43–5. The exact contents of the fragments were recorded by E. Ulrich, "Index of Passages in the 'Biblical Texts'," *DJD* XXXIX, 192–4.

[6] This is the "large" Isaiah scroll from cave 1, also named the "St. Mark's Isaiah."

[7] This is the "small" Isaiah scroll from cave 1, also named the "Hebrew University Isaiah."

[8] Preliminarily published by J. Muilenburg, "Fragments of Another Qumran Isaiah Scroll," *BASOR* 135 (1954) 28–32.

[9] See P. W. Skehan, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," *CBQ* 17 (1955) 158–63, esp. 162–3.

[10] This is the only Isaiah fragment written on papyrus. Very few papyrus fragments of the biblical books have been preserved at Qumran, and their background is not clear. The suggestion has been made that some of these were personal rather than official copies. See *Scribal Practices*, 44–53.

[11] Published in *DJD* II, 79–80 and pl. XXII.

2. Past Research on 1QIsa[a][12]

The scroll that has been studied more than any of the others from Qumran is the "large" Isaiah scroll from cave 1, 1QIsa[a], probably written between 150–125 BCE.[13] This text was named the "large" Isaiah scroll since it was preserved in its entirety, in contradistinction to the "small" Isaiah scroll, 1QIsa[b]. It has also been named the "St. Mark's Isaiah" because it was initially owned by the St. Mark's Monastery. 1QIsa[a] was preserved in its entirety because it was well kept in a jar. It is not known whether this system of storage reflects the Qumran community's special esteem for this particular copy of Isaiah. The Syrian Metropolitan, Mar Athanasius Samuel, took this scroll and three others (1QapGen ar, 1QpHab, and 1QS) to the United States in 1949, where they were purchased on behalf of the State of Israel in 1954. The large Isaiah scroll is the longest preserved biblical scroll among the scroll specimens (7.34 m), surpassed only by a nonbiblical composition, 11QT[a] (8.148 m; reconstructed total length 8.75 m). The two Isaiah scrolls from cave 1 were among the first to be published, 1QIsa[a] as early as 1950,[14] and 1QIsa[b] in 1954[15] and 1955,[16] and as a rule their content and description greatly influenced scholarship. For a long period, these scrolls alone represented for scholarship the Dead Sea scrolls, and many generalizations regarding biblical scrolls or the Qumran scrolls as a whole were made on the basis of their form and content. Thus it became commonplace to say that while the biblical texts from Qumran differed much from MT in small details, they contributed little to our knowledge of the biblical text,[17] since the readings of these scrolls were

[12] Cf. A.S. van der Woude, "Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974–1988)," *TRu* 57 (1992) 1–57, esp. 1–5; P.W. Flint, "The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Bible as Book*, 229–51.

[13] Thus Cross, *ALQ*[3], 176 on the basis of paleographical analysis. The radiocarbon date of this text is 335–122 BCE according to the examinations of A. J. T. Jull, D. J. Donahue, M. Broshi, and E. Tov, "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995) 11–19. An earlier examination ascribed a date of 199–120 BCE to this text: G. Bonani, M. Broshi, I. Carmi, S. Ivy, J. Strugnell, and W. Wölfli, "Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Atiqot* 20 (1991) 27–32.

[14] Burrows, *Isaiah*. The photographs of the scroll are poorly reproduced, and the transcriptions are not up the standards accepted from 1955 onwards in the *DJD* series, especially with regard to partially preserved letters and reconstructions. Better plates, based on J.C. Trever's photographs, are included in F.M. Cross et al., *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave I: The Great Isaiah Scroll, the Order of the Community, the* Pesher *to Habakkuk* (Jerusalem: Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and the Shrine of the Book, 1972); Parry-Qimron, *Isaiah*, and E. Ulrich and F.W. Flint, *DJD* XXXII, forthcoming.

[15] Sukenik, *'wṣr hmgylwt hgnwzwt*. Several segments of the scroll were published earlier: *Mgylwt gnwzwt, mtwk gnyzh qdwmh shnmṣ'h bmdbr yhwdh, sqyrh r'shwnh* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1948); *Mgylwt gnwzwt, mtwk gnyzh qdwmh shnmṣ'h bmdbr yhwdh, sqyrh shnyh* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950).

[16] D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *DJD* I, 66–8 and plate XII.

[17] This claim has been made by several scholars, influenced much by a series of studies on this topic by H.M. Orlinsky: "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll," *JBL* 69 (1950) 149–66;

considered to be more or less identical to MT (1QIsa[b]) or were often described as secondary when compared with MT (1QIsa[a]). While these statements on the intrinsic value of the texts are correct, neither of these texts is representative of the Qumran scrolls,[18] and therefore no generalizations should be made. In fact, none of the scrolls found at Qumran is representative of the *ensemble* of Qumran texts. At this point a general consideration is in order: the study of the biblical (and nonbiblical) texts from Qumran would have been different had the texts from cave 4 been published first or simultaneously with those from cave 1. As it happened, the special characteristics of 1QIsa[a] were often considered by scholars to be the norm with regard to all aspects of the Qumran texts. It is true that other, nonbiblical, Qumran texts were known in the early days of the scroll research, especially from cave 1, but many of their scribal features ran parallel to those of 1QIsa[a] (see further chapter 10*). As a result, the description of the other biblical texts, more so than that of the nonbiblical texts, was based heavily on 1QIsa[a]. The impact of 1QIsa[b] was felt less, especially since it was so similar to MT. A few other Qumran texts were known in the early years: 4QQoh[a] was published preliminarily in 1954,[19] there were scattered pieces of information on sundry texts,[20] and in 1955 fourteen relatively short texts from cave 1 were published in *DJD* I. In the early years of Qumran research, all of these texts were less influential on scholarship than the Isaiah texts from cave 1. This was due partly to the fact that these texts were freely available, and partly because of their book-size publications, the first of their kind, that preceded the *DJD* series by several years.

3. Features of 1QIsa[a]

Even today, after most of the Qumran texts have either been published or are known in some form or other, 1QIsa[a] stands out as the scroll about which more aspects have been researched and hence are known better than the other Qumran biblical texts. It has been published in three facsimile editions (Burrows, Cross, Parry-Qimron; see note 14), and two transcribed texts (Burrows and Parry-Qimron). An additional edition is forthcoming (see n. 14). The most extensive linguistic treatment of any of the Qumran texts has been devoted to this scroll.[21] Likewise, the most extensive study to date on scribal habits is devoted to this and several other texts from cave 1.[22] The only biblical text from Qumran on which

JNES 11 (1952) 153–6; *JJS* 2 (1950–1951) 151–4; *JQR* 43 (1952–1953) 329–40; *IEJ* 4 (1954) 5–8; *HUCA* 25 (1954) 85–92.

[18] This observation was already made in 1979 by Skehan, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran," 810.

[19] J. Muilenburg, "A Qoheleth Scroll from Qumran," *BASOR* 135 (1954) 20–28.

[20] See especially Cross, *ALQ*[3].

[21] Kutscher, *Language.*

[22] Martin, *Scribal Character*.

a "literary analysis" was composed is the Isaiah scroll.[23] More than seventy-five scholarly articles have been written on various aspects of this scroll.[24] Its readings are listed as variants deviating from MT in the third apparatus of the seventh edition[25] of *BH* and in the *HUB*.[26] Since it was a novelty to be able to compare the medieval MT with an ancient manuscript dating from the turn of the eras, virtually every aspect of the scroll was studied in monographic articles.[27] This pertains to the special orthographical and morphological features of the scroll,[28] its scribal phenomena,[29] marginal notations,[30] deviations from MT,[31] relation to

[23] J. R. Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll – A Literary Analysis. A Comparison with the Masoretic Text and the Biblia Hebraica* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970). See also W. H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible, with Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964). This translation is now joined by M. G. Abegg et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).

[24] For the most recent studies, see García Martínez-Parry, *Bibliography*. Some studies are listed in the following notes.

[25] See chapter 18*, n. 33.

[26] Goshen-Gottstein, *Isaiah.* See also chapter 16*.

[27] Among the monographic studies, beyond Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle* and Kutscher, *Language*, see F. D. James, *A Critical Examination of the Text of Isaiah, Based on the Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah (DSIa), the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint … ,* unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1959; F. J. Morrow, *The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,* unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. , 1973; J. Koenig, *L'Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaie* (VTSup 33; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1982); J. Høgenhaven, "The First Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIs[a]) and the Massoretic Text. Some Reflections with Special Regard to Isaiah 1–12," *JSOT* 28 (1984) 17–35; Pulikottil, *Transmission* (see n. 48 below). The latter study summarizes several aspects of the research on 1QIsa[a] and provides some bibliography.

[28] The literature on this topic is very extensive. The major monographs remain those of Martin and Kutscher (see notes 21–22). See further M. Burrows, "Orthography, Morphology, and Syntax of the St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript," *JBL* 68 (1949) 195–211; A. Rubinstein, "Notes on the Use of the Tenses in the Variant Readings of the Isaiah Scroll," *VT* 3 (1953) 92–5; idem, "Formal Agreement of Parallel Clauses in the Isaiah Scroll," *VT* 4 (1954) 316–21; M. Martin, "The Use of Second Person Singular Suffixes in 1QIs[a]," *Muséon* 70 (1957) 127–44; J. Leveen, "The Orthography of the Hebrew Scroll of Isaiah A," *Proceedings of the 22nd Congress of Orientalists (Istanbul 1951)* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957) 577–83; P. Wernberg-Møller, "Studies in the Defective Spellings in the Isaiah Scroll of St. Mark's Monastery," *JSS* 3 (1958) 244–64; M. Goshen-Gottstein, "Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents," ScrHier 4 (1958) 101–36, reprinted in *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran* (Tel Aviv: Orient Publishing House, 1960) 97–132; A. González, "La lengua y la base lingüística del Rollo de Isaías," *EstBíb* 19 (1960) 237–44; J. Koenig, "Réouverture du débat sur la première main rédactionnelle du rouleau ancien d'Isaïe de Qumran (1QIs[a]) en 40,7–8," *RevQ* 11 (1983) 219–37; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 261–73; F. M. Cross, Jr., "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in Trebolle, *Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1–14.

[29] Beyond Martin, *Scribal Character*, see C. Kuhl, "Schreibereigentümlichkeiten – Bemerkungen zur Jesajarolle (DSIa)," *VT* 2 (1952) 307–33.

[30] See especially Martin, *Scribal Character*; J. L. Teicher, "The Christian Interpretation of the Sign X in the Isaiah Scroll," *VT* 5 (1955) 189–98; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 178–218.

[31] Since the scroll is a witness to the text of the Bible, most of the articles and books on 1QIsa[a] belong to this category. Yet, there is no monograph that analyzes all or most of the readings of the scroll comprehensively. Kutscher's monograph comes closest to this goal as it probably mentions all or most of the differences between MT and the scroll, but describes them

the ancient versions[32] and medieval Hebrew manuscripts,[33] typological similarity to the SP[34] and the Severus Scroll,[35] the relation to the textual tradition of Kings in the parallel sections of Isaiah and 2 Kings, paleography,[36] writing by two different scribes,[37] system of text division into different units,[38] and its exegetical elements.

---

mainly on the linguistic level. Less comprehensive with regard to the readings themselves, but more comprehensive regarding their background is A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches, Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) revised from his Ph.D. diss.: *De oude tekstgetuigen van het boek Jesaja*, Utrecht University, 1978.

[32] M. H. Gottstein, "Die Jesajah-Rolle im Lichte von Peschitta und Targum," *Bib* 35 (1954) 51–71; A. Penna, "La Volgata e il manoscritto 1QIs[a]," *Bib* 38 (1957) 381–95; J. Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIs[a])," *JBL* 78 (1959) 34–59.

[33] See M. H. Gottstein, "Die Jesaiah-Rolle und das Problem der hebräischen Bibelhandschriften," *Bib* 35 (1954) 429–42.

[34] See Kutscher, *Language*, 566–7; Z. Ben-Hayyim, "*mswrt hshwmrwnym wzyqth lmswrt hlshwn shl mgylwt ym hmlh wlshwn hz"l*," *Leshonenu* 22 (1958) 223–45; M. Mansoor, "Some Linguistic Aspects of the Qumran Texts," *JSS* 3 (1958) 46–9.

[35] Kutscher, *Language*, 87–9; J. P. Siegel, "The Severus Scroll and 1QIs[a]," in *1972 and 1973 Proceedings of the International Organization for Masoretic Studies* (ed. H. M. Orlinsky; SBLMasS 2; 1974) 99–110.

[36] See Martin, *Scribal Character*.

[37] The assumption that a second scribe started his work with col. XXVIII (chapter 33) of 1QIsa[a] at the beginning of a new sheet was accepted by several scholars, while for Martin the two segments of that scroll were written by the same scribe: Martin, *Scribal Character,* 65–73; thus also Kutscher, *Language,* 564–6; J. Cook, "Orthographical Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls," *RevQ* 14 (1989) 293–305, esp. 303–4. However, the assumption of the bipartition of the scroll seems to be more sound: Thus M. Noth, "Eine Bemerkung zur Jesajarolle vom Toten Meer," *VT* 1 (1951) 224–6; Kuhl, "Schreibereigentümlichkeiten" (see n. 29), esp. 332–3. This assumption is supported by arguments at the paleography level, but also at other levels. The second scribe wrote with a fuller orthography than the first one; note, for example, the preponderance of the shorter form of the second person singular masculine suffix in the first part of the scroll compared with the longer form in the second part, as described in detail by Martin, "The Use" (see n. 28 above). The second scribe corrected more gutturals than scribe A. See R. L. Giese, "Further Evidence for the Bisection of 1QIs[a]," *Textus* 14 (1988) 61–70. See further W. H. Brownlee, "The Literary Significance of the Bisection of Isaiah in the Ancient Scroll of Isaiah from Qumran," *Proceedings of the 25th Congress of Orientalists* (Moscow, 1962–1963) 431–7; K. H. Richards, "A Note on the Bisection of Isaiah," *RevQ* 5 (1965) 257–8; J. Cook, "The Dichotomy of 1QIsa[a]," in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z. J. Kapera; Qumranica Mogilanensia 6; Kraków: Enigma, 1992) I.7–24.

[38] Y. Maori, "The Tradition of Pisqa'ot in Ancient Hebrew MSS – The Isaiah Texts and Commentaries from Qumran," *Textus* 10 (1982) א–ב; O. H. Steck, *Die erste Jesajarolle von Qumran (1QIsa): Schreibweise als Leseanleitung für ein Prophetenbuch* (SBS 173/1; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998); idem, "Bemerkungen zur Abschnittgliederung in den Jesaja-Handschriften aus der Wüste Juda," in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. U. Dahmen et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000) 51–88.

The latter aspect is of particular interest. Already in 1955, Chamberlain recognized messianic interpretations in several readings in the scroll.[39] For example, according to this scholar, the third person forms זרועו (2x) and אליו in 1QIsa[a] 51:5 for זר(ו)עי and אלי in MT refer to the Messiah, and the other words in the context were conceived of as "messianic names": ישעי, תורה, משפטי, צדקי, ישועתי, and צדקתי. In the same year, Rubinstein showed interest in "theological" aspects of some variant readings.[40] The descriptive term "theological," used in the title of this study should, according to Rubinstein, be used in a limited sense, "as denoting certain religious susceptibilities which can reasonably be inferred from the variant readings selected for discussion."[41] All the readings selected by him are undoubtedly of importance for understanding the scribe, but it is often difficult to know whether the change is intentional and therefore carries theological implications. Thus, the following change has undoubtedly been made on the basis of the context:

Isa 45:7 MT	עשה שלום ובורא רע (= V, T)
	I make *prosperity* and I create disaster.
1QIsa[a]	עושה טוב ובורה רע
	I make *the good* and I create the evil.

We need not go as far as Rubinstein, who sees in this reading "an affirmation of the doctrine of the sectaries of Qumran, who held that both good and evil are created by God and that the morally good or bad in human conduct is predetermined by Him, at least for the duration of the period preceding the ultimate 'visitation.'"[42] Talmon likewise discussed the exegetical aspects of several readings.[43] According to van der Kooij, the readings of this scroll, as of any other biblical text, need to be viewed not as reflecting occasional and unrelated exegesis, but as exponents of a more or less coherent exegetical system within each pericope (cf. e. g. his analysis of 8:4–11),[44] certainly in those places in which the paragraph division in 1QIsa[a] differs from that of MT.[45] A similar approach underlies the text-critical com-

[39] J. V. Chamberlain, "The Functions of God as Messianic Titles in the Complete Qumran Isaiah Scroll," *VT* 5 (1955) 366–72.

[40] A. Rubinstein, "The Theological Aspect of Some Variant Readings in the Isaiah Scroll," *JSS* 6 (1955) 187–200.

[41] Rubinstein, "The Theological Aspect," 187.

[42] Rubinstein, "The Theological Aspect," 194. Besides, it has not yet been established that a Qumran scribe inserted sectarian readings in a biblical scroll. See chapter 10*, n. 55.

[43] S. Talmon, "DSIa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah," *ASTI* 1 (1962) 62–72 = idem, *The World of Qumran from Within* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989) 131–41; idem, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of the Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964) 95–132.

[44] A. van der Kooij, "*1QIsa[a]* Col. VIII, 4–11 (Isa 8, 11–18): A Contextual Approach of its Variants," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 569–81.

[45] Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen* (see n. 31). See further the previous note. For examples

mentary of Barthélemy.[46] A special type of content exegesis in this scroll, as well as in the LXX, is recognized by Koenig, who describes at length the background of small pluses in the scroll.[47] These are not just incidental scribal pluses, but they reflect a refined system of what the author names "herméneutique analogique," and which links certain texts internally, similar to the rabbinic *gezerah shavah.*

When focusing on 1QIsa[a], we note a number of special features that have been alluded to above in the studies written on various aspects of the scroll. Some of these are characteristic of this scroll, while others are not. Thus the orthographic and morphological features of the scroll are characteristic several biblical texts (see below). Characteristic features of this scroll are:

a. The division of the scroll into two segments (Isaiah 1–34 and 35–66), written by two different scribes. Scribe B started with col. XXVIII, at the beginning of a new sheet. Although two or more hands are visible in other Qumran scrolls (1QH[a], 1QpHab, 11QT[a]), in no other source is the text so neatly divided as in 1QIsa[a]: Scribe A left three lines empty at the end of col. XXVII, at the end of a sheet, the last one written by him. Scribe B started at the beginning of the next sheet with col. XXVIII (Isa 34:1–36:2). It is unlikely that the two scribes worked concurrently, since it would have been difficult for the first scribe to calculate how many columns and sheets he would need for his assignment.[48] Several scholars accepted the assumption of bisection, while others maintained that the two segments of that scroll were written by the same scribe.[49] However, the assumption of the bipartition of the scroll seems to be defensible not only at the paleographical level, but also on other levels. The second scribe adopted a fuller orthography than the first,[50] corrected more gutturals than scribe A (Giese,

---

of exegesis underlying different paragraph divisions, see Høgenhaven, "The First Isaiah Scroll," 28–9 (see n. 27 above).

[46] Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 3.

[47] J. Koenig, *L'Herméneutique analogique du Judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1982). See my review in *Bib* 65 (1984) 118–21, and that of A. van der Kooij, "Accident or Method: On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Testament Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIs[a]," BibOr 43 (1986) 366–76. The special importance of the pluses in the Isaiah scroll based on other verses was recognized by Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts," 150.

[48] For an analysis of the features of the two scribal hands of Isaiah, see M. Noth, "Eine Bemerkung zur Jesajarolle vom Toten Meer," *VT* 1 (1951) 224–6; Kuhl, "Schreibereigentümlichkeiten" (see n. 29 above) esp. 332–3; Brownlee, "Literary Significance" (see n. 37); Richards, "Note" (see n. 37); Giese, "Further Evidence" (see n. 37); Cook, "Dichotomy" (see n. 37); M. Abegg, "1QIsa[a] and 1QIsa[b]: A Rematch" in *The Bible as Book,* 221–8 (statistics of different orthographic systems); P. Pulikottil, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran – The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa[a]* (JSOTSup 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 18–20; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 21.

[49] See n. 37.

[50] Note, for example, the preponderance of the shorter form of the second person singular masculine suffix in the first part of the scroll as against the longer form in the second part, as described in detail by M. Martin, "The Use …" Furthermore, in the second part of the scroll כי is consistently written *plene* (כיא), but only in twenty percent of the instances in the first part.

"Further Evidence"), used specific scribal marks, and left out more sections than the first scribe, to be filled in subsequently by a different hand in small letters between the lines and in the margin: cols. XXXII 14 (Isa 38:21), XXXIII 7 (Isa 40:7) and XXXIII 14 (Isa 40:14) – for more details, see chapter 5*, n. 15.

b. Unusual marginal signs occurring in various places in the scroll, not all of them understandable,[51] are in three cases almost identical to signs in 1QS.[52] They were probably produced by the same scribe, that is, the person who inserted the corrections in the Isaiah scroll and wrote the text of 1QS (as well as 1QSa, 1QSb, and 4QSam^{c}).[53] Some of these scribal markings are letters in the paleo-Hebrew script, while others are similar to letters in the Cryptic A script.[54] In 1QIsa^{a}, they may refer to the sectarian reading of certain passages,[55] or to matters of sectarian interest. In any event, since the identification of the so-called Cryptic A script for the use of sectarian texts is solid (chapter 27*, n. 17), it is now clear that at least some of the Qumran texts were either used by the Qumran community or copied by its scribes.

c. The copyist of 1QIsa^{a} produced a carelessly and irregularly written copy that was full of errors. Many of these errors were corrected, and, in fact, of all the Qumran texts, this one contains the largest proportion of corrections, viz. an average of one scribal intervention to every four lines of text.[56] All the corrections in this scroll, as in all other scrolls from the Judean Desert, were made on the basis of the scribe's *Vorlage*, his orthographic system, or his insights. In the texts reflecting a system of orthography and morphology different from MT, as in the case of 1QIsa^{a}, several corrections distance them further from MT. These corrections were presumably not made on the basis of an external source, but rather according to an orthographic framework the scribe had in mind, inconsistent though it may have been. At the same time, 1QIsa^{a} also contains several corrections toward a text identical to the proto-Masoretic text. As these corrections agree with MT, while others bring the text into disagreement with MT, the assumption that the corrections were based on an external source is very unlikely. 1QIsa^{a} was corrected both by the original scribe and a later hand, probably in accordance with the manuscript from which this scroll was originally copied.

---

[51] Several of the signs, if not most of them, indicate the division of the text into sense units, even though the system is not carried out consistently.

[52] *Scribal Practices*, 361–5.

[53] See E. Ulrich, "4QSam^{c}: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hayyaḥad* (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1979) 1–25.

[54] *Scribal Practices*, 361–5.

[55] Thus already Burrows, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* XVI.

[56] *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 8, col. 10.

d. The scribe of 1QIsa[a] was more influenced by Aramaic than most other Qumran scribes.[57] A relatively sizeable number of Aramaisms is found in 4QCant[b] that is written in a different orthographic convention.[58]

e. The scribe of 1QIsa[a] changed many details in accord with the context.[59]

f. The numerous phonetic variants in 1QIsa[a] gave rise to speculation that this and other scrolls were not produced by conventional copying from another text, but rather by dictation.[60] It is not impossible that some scribes were dictated to or that mass production (dictating to several scribes simultaneously) took place, but there is no evidence supporting this view. Phonetic variation does not necessarily prove this assumption, since any scribe copying from another document could make phonetic mistakes or change the orthography, consciously or not.[61]

g. The division of 1QIsa[a] into sense units was analyzed in detail by Bardtke,[62] Oesch,[63] and Maori.[64] The studies by Oesch and Maori show that in 80 percent of the cases, 1QIsa[a] agrees with the medieval MT (manuscripts A and C).

h. The typological similarity between 1QIsa[a] and the Severus Scroll was described by Kutscher, *Language*, and Siegel, *The Severus Scroll* (see n. 35). Both sources were dubbed "vulgar" by these scholars. According to Kutscher, 1QIsa[a] was a personal copy used for study, home reading, and perhaps in the synagogue, while MT reflected the standard text used in Palestine.[65]

4. The Text of Isaiah at Qumran

When trying to locate information concerning the textual transmission of Isaiah as viewed from the Qumran texts, we should lower our level of expectation:

a. There are many gaps in our information regarding the period covered by the Qumran manuscripts (middle of the third century BCE until the middle of the first century CE), both concerning the Qumran text(s) and the texts extant in

[57] See the elaborate description by Kutscher, *Isaiah*.

[58] *DJD* XVI, 205–18.

[59] See *TCHB*, 110–11 as well as two brief articles by A. Rubinstein (see n. 28) that illustrate this point. In his 1954 article, Rubinstein exemplifies the adaptation of small grammatical elements in 1QIsa[a] to the parallel stich, and in his 1953 article he exemplifies the simplification of the tense system.

[60] Thus Burrows, "Orthography, Morphology," 196 (see n. 28 above); Orlinsky, "Studies," 165 (see n. 17 above).

[61] Thus already E. Hammershaimb, "On the Method Applied in the Copying of Manuscripts in Qumran," *VT* 9 (1959) 415–8.

[62] H. Bardtke, "Die Paraschenneinteilung der Jesajarolle I," in *Festschrift Franz Dornseiff zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Kusch; Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, 1953) 33–75.

[63] J.M. Oesch, *Petucha und Setuma, Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des Alten Testaments* (OBO 27; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/ Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 200–48.

[64] Maori, "Tradition" (see n. 38).

[65] Kutscher, *Language,* 77–89.

Palestine as a whole. There could have been widely divergent texts of Isaiah both at Qumran and elsewhere that by chance were not preserved.

b. As far as we know, no patterns of textual transmission developed that were specific to the special contents of any single biblical book. Therefore, it is probably mere coincidence that among the Prophetical Books texts written in the Qumran scribal practice were preserved for Isaiah (1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c]) and Jeremiah (2QJer), but not for Ezekiel.

c. When describing the texts of Isaiah, we are confronted with the special circumstance that the MT and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX were close to each other. Even though the LXX translation often differs much from MT, our analysis of the translator's exegesis and his translation techniques leads us to believe that the translator often deviated from his parent text, when that was probably very close to MT. The practical result of this situation is that the Qumran texts are compared with the combined evidence of the MT and LXX, although occasionally a Qumran text contains a reading found in the LXX and not in MT, or vice versa.

Comparison of Isaiah in MT and LXX

Any comparative analysis of the Isaiah texts is based on the fact that the amount of variation between the texts is relatively limited. The known textual data for Isaiah point to a picture of textual *unity*, more than in the Torah and much more than in the other two comparable books of the Prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The main textual feature recognizable for the Isaiah texts is the existence of two different scribal traditions, visible in differences in the areas of orthography, morphology, and scribal habits, represented in MT and some Qumran texts.

α. *The MT group*. Most of the Qumran texts of Isaiah reflect the same consonantal framework as the medieval MT. This group of texts is named the "MT group," although it is difficult to determine exactly which texts should be included and which should not. A good example of this group is 1QIsa[b], which presents a relatively extensive text for comparison with MT (from chapter 38 to the end of the book, with some gaps). Its readings were first listed by S. Loewinger,[66] and the differences between 1QIsa[b] and 1QIsa[a] were analyzed by Barthélemy.[67] When comparing 1QIsa[b], dating from the first century BCE, with codex L written one thousand years later, one easily recognizes the close relation between the two texts that are sometimes almost identical. Thus on p. 7 = plate 9 (Isa 50:7–51:10 [13 verses]) of this scroll in the Sukenik edition, one finds only four differences in

[66] S. Loewinger, "The Variants of DSI II," *VT* 4 (1954) 155–63.
[67] Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle,* cii–cviii.

minor details and two differences in orthography (our reading differs from that of Sukenik), as analyzed elsewhere.[68]

The close relation between 1QIsa[b] and the medieval text can also be expressed in terms of types of differences between the two. When examining all the fragments of 1QIsa[b], which comprises segments of 46 chapters, we find the following types of features in the scroll that represent differences from codex L, all of which concern minutiae:[69]

Orthography	107
Addition of conjunctive *waw*	16
Lack of conjunctive *waw*	13
Article	4
Differences in letters	10
Missing letters	5
Differences in number	14
Differences in pronouns	6
Different grammatical forms	24
Different prepositions	9
Different words	11
Minuses of words	5
Pluses of words	6
Different sequence	4

Roberts therefore correctly stated in 1959: "The almost complete absence of textual variants is the clearest indication of the close affinity between the two text-forms, for in one instance only can a case be made for a significant variant reading. It is in 53.11."[70] The detailed analysis of Barthélemy[71] shows clearly that 1QIsa[b] is closely aligned with MT, from which 1QIsa[a] deviates, not only in orthography, but also in some content variants. Garbini's claim[72] that this scroll is actually not of a Masoretic character is therefore unfounded.[73] According to

---

[68] Tov, *TCHB*, 31. Few Qumran texts are closer to the medieval text than 1QIsa[b]. At the same time, 4QGen[b], published in *DJD* XII, is virtually identical to the medieval text.

[69] Quoted from M. Cohen, "*h'ydy'h bdbr qdwsht hnwsh l'wtywtyw wbyqwrt htkst*," *Deoth* 47 (1978) 83–101 = *The Bible and Us* (ed. U. Simon; Heb.; Tel Aviv: Devir, 1979) 42–69. See also *TCHB,* 31–3.

[70] B. J. Roberts, "The Second Isaiah Scroll from Qumrân (1QIs[b])," *BJRL* 42 (1959) 132–44. The quotation is from p. 134.

[71] Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, cii–cxvi.

[72] G. Garbini, "1QIsa[b] et le texte d'Isaïe," *Hen* 6 (1984) 17–21.

[73] Against the majority view regarding the character of 1QIsa[b], Garbini suggested that this scroll is quite remote from MT. In order to prove this point, Garbini adduced a list of seven differences in single words and the omission of 38:13 as well as of the end/beginning of 60:19/20. In addition, a calculation of the number of lines per column leads the author to believe that some thirty verses of Isaiah were missing in the scroll. However, Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle,*

Barthélemy, the initial text of 1QIsa[b], as well as that of MurIsa, was corrected several times towards the text that would later become MT.[74]

The close relationship between the medieval representative of MT, L, and 1QIsa[b] is matched by almost all the texts of Isaiah from cave 4. Indeed, in the sections in which 1QIsa[b] overlaps with 4QIsa[b] and 4QIsa[d], all of them are close to codex L. This generalization also pertains to the following texts, which are close to MT and secondarily also to the LXX: 4QIsa[a], 4QIsa[e], 4QIsa[f], 4QIsa[g] (of these, 4QIsa[e,f] probably differed most from the medieval text). It also pertains to the following texts, although they are too short for pronouncing a clear judgment: 4QIsa[h], 4QIsa[i], 4QIsa[j], 4QIsa[k], 4QIsa[l], 4QIsa[m], 4QIsa[n], 4QIsa[o], 4QpapIsa[p], 4QIsa[q], 4QIsa[r].

The Qumran proto-Masoretic group ought to be investigated with regard to possible clusters within this group regarding spelling and content, but because of the paucity of overlapping Qumran texts, this investigation is by nature very limited. A possible clustering of 1QIsa[a,b] and 4QIsa[c,d] (of which 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c] reflect the Qumran orthography), against the medieval text, is visible. Such clusters, if detected, could show how MT developed after the Qumran period. It should thus be possible to pinpoint readings in which the medieval text reflects a later development. Thus, in Isa 53:11, against the medieval MT יראה (מעמל נפשו), two proto-Masoretic Qumran texts, 1QIsa[b] and 4QIsa[d], as well as 1QIsa[a] (Qumran scribal practice) and the LXX (δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς) add אור. Seeligmann suggested that the minority reading of the medieval MT reflects the original text.[75]

β. *The LXX of Isaiah*. Although the LXX translation often deviates greatly from MT because of the LXX's extensive exegesis, there is no reason to believe that its underlying Hebrew text differed much from MT. Therefore, the list of minor agreements between the LXX and 1QIsa[a][76] does not substantially alter this picture.

γ. *Texts Reflecting the Qumran Scribal Practice*. The idiosyncrasies in orthography, morphology, and scribal habits of 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c][77] set them apart from the other Isaiah texts, but not from other Qumran texts.[78] Contextual

---

cii–ciii refutes this view as being based on imprecise data and methodologically incorrect suppositions.

[74] Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle,* cxiii. This assumption is unlikely because the level of disagreement between 1QIsa[b] and MurIsa on the one hand and the medieval MT on the other is much higher than the details in which the former had presumably been corrected. It is more likely that when errors were made, the scribe or a first reader sometimes adapted the text to the *Vorlage* from which the text was copied. See *Scribal Practices*, 223–5.

[75] I. L. Seeligmann, "δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς," *Tarbiz* 27 (1958) 127–41 (Heb.).

[76] See Ziegler, "Die Vorlage" (see n. 32 above); Morrow, *The Text of Isaiah*, 182–4 (see n. 27).

[77] The close connection between these two texts was already recognized by Skehan, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran," 812.

[78] See chapter 10* and *Scribal Practices*, 261–73.

harmonizations abound in 1QIsa[a], as shown in brief studies by Rubinstein (see notes 28 and 40). This text, as well as 4QIsa[c], was possibly copied from one that differed little from the Isaiah scrolls from cave 4, or from 1QIsa[b], most of which are rather close to MT. One of the special characteristics of 4QIsa[c] is its writing of the Tetragrammaton and other divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters. This feature is shared with another twenty-three Qumran texts, mainly nonbiblical.[79] 4QIsa[c], like 4QLev[g] and 4QpPs[b], also wrote the prefixes to the divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters (Isa 26:4; 44:5); this text stands alone in writing also the suffixes of *'elohim* in paleo-Hebrew characters (Isa 51:15; 52:10; 55:5).

Of special interest is the comparison of 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c] in overlapping passages. These two texts reflect a similar orthographical and linguistic system, but they differ in details.[80] These differences are not surprising since both texts are to some degree internally inconsistent with regard to orthography and language. Thus the second part of 1QIsa[a] is more *plene* than the first part. Accordingly, in the first part of that book, 4QIsa[c] usually is more *plene* than 1QIsa[a], while in the second part (cols. XXVIII ff. of 1QIsa[a]) the two are closer to each other.

The Qumran Scrolls and Literary Criticism

There has been no evidence in any of the scrolls to either prove or disprove the existence of two different segments, Isaiah and Second Isaiah, and in fact the scrolls derive from too late a period in order to contain evidence of this type. The writing of 1QIsa[a] by two scribes (Isaiah 1–34 and 35–66) cannot be taken as evidence in this regard, since it reflects a mere scribal convenience to subdivide the book into two equal parts.

On the basis of the addition in 1QIsa[a] of what constitutes 38:21–22 in MT, it has been suggested by some scholars that these two verses in MT and other witnesses constitute a late editorial addition to the book.[81]

---

[79] For a detailed analysis of the writing of the different divine names in paleo-Hebrew, see *Scribal Practices*, 238–46 (with references to earlier literature).

[80] For example, in one column, 1QIsa[a] XVIII–XIX // 4QIsa[c] frgs. 9ii, 11, 12i, 52 (Isa 23:8–24:15), the two scribes agree 20 times against MT in their fuller orthography, and three times in linguistic variations. At the same time, they disagree among each other 14 times in matters of orthography, and twice in linguistic variations.

[81] S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard University Press, 1976) 328–32; Y. Zakovitch, "Assimilation in Biblical Narratives," in *Empirical Models*, 175–96; see also the discussion in *TCHB,* 340–42.

5. Conclusion

The Qumran scrolls of Isaiah add textual data to what was known before their discovery, and this information is as a rule of great importance for our understanding of the textual transmission of the book and its exegesis. As expected, all the sources of Isaiah differ from each other, but their level of differentiation is not very high. The number of proto-Masoretic texts is remarkable (see chapter 10*). If the two texts written in the Qumran scribal practice, 1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c], were copied from a text like the proto-Masoretic texts, they ultimately reflect the same textual family. This pertains also to the Hebrew parent text of the LXX. Therefore, the known texts of Isaiah do not differ from each other recensionally.[82]

[82] We therefore agree with the 1957 statement of Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts," 150: "For Isaias, the complete scroll from cave 1 remains textually the most interesting document, and there is nothing among the 13 manuscripts of cave 4 which is recensionally different from the received consonantal text, or yields improved readings in any significant degree."

Chapter Six

Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention Paid to the Samaritan Pentateuch

1. Background

This study addresses the question of the fine line between biblical manuscripts and rewritten Bible texts, and in so doing we turn not only to matters of definition, but also to features common to these two types of texts.

The defining of the biblical manuscripts and rewritten Bible compositions should not be difficult in theory since the two groups of texts seem to be easily distinguishable from one another. However, in practice the distinction is difficult. A biblical *manuscript* has an authoritative status as Scripture, even if the manuscript is replete with exegetical changes (additions, omissions) vis-à-vis earlier texts, whereas a rewritten Bible *composition* does not constitute an authoritative biblical text, but rather a new composition based on the Bible. However, the distinction between these two groups remains difficult since it at times it is hard to establish a manuscript's authoritative status. It is not the amount of exegesis or deviation from MT that counts, but the purpose behind the writing of the manuscript under investigation. Thus, the various texts of Jeremiah (MT, the *Vorlage* of the LXX, Qumran texts from caves 2 and 4) are biblical, and in spite of the major differences among them, they remain within the biblical realm. The exact relation between the different manuscripts is subject to constant discussion among scholars, but all agree that these are biblical texts. Thus, the pre-Samaritan texts and SP reflect much content exegesis vis-à-vis the earlier texts, and they constitute a greatly edited text. However, they were considered authoritative by the Samaritan community as well as the Qumran community, whose writings were sometimes based on them (4QTest and 4QJub). Likewise, the proto-Masoretic texts, which contained only a low level of exegesis vis-à-vis earlier texts, had an authoritative status in Temple circles from a certain period onwards (see chapter 12*). By the same token, the Hebrew compositions translated by the LXX translators such as 1 Kings and Esther were considered authoritative by these translators and by the community in which they lived. Likewise, the Greek translation itself enjoyed such an authoritative status.[1]

[1] On all these issues, see chapter 20* and Tov, "Many Forms."

This leads to the question of how to distinguish between authoritative biblical texts reflecting content exegesis, and texts that are no longer considered biblical. How do we define a manuscript that resembles a biblical text but was not considered authoritative? The dividing line between biblical and nonbiblical texts was not as fixed as we would like to believe. Three types of non-authoritative texts have a close relation to Hebrew Scripture and can easily be confused with Scripture texts.

a. *Liturgical texts* composed of biblical sections or combinations of biblical and nonbiblical sections are rather numerous among the Qumran texts. The best-known examples are 11QPs[a] and such Torah texts as 4QDeut[n] and 4QDeut[j].[2]

b. *Abbreviated and excerpted* biblical texts were prepared for special purposes that are not always clear to us. Some of these collections were liturgical, such as the previously mentioned group. Others probably reflected a literary preference, such as 4QDeut[q] that contains only the song of Deuteronomy 32, and the abbreviated texts of Canticles contained in two excerpted manuscripts, 4QCant[a,b].[3]

c. *Rewritten Bible texts* are newly created literary compositions that to a great extent overlap with biblical manuscripts. The definition of what constitutes a rewritten Bible text is less clear now than it was a few years ago. Before the Qumran texts were found, scholars were aware of a series of rewritten biblical texts of very diverse nature. Foremost among them is the book of Jubilees. Pseudo-Philo created another rewritten text, as did Josephus in his rewritten story of Hebrew Scripture in *Jewish Antiquities*. Beyond these texts, we now know from Qumran an additional group of rewritten Bible texts, all fragmentary, ranging from compositions changing the biblical text only minimally to those compositions in which the substratum of the biblical text is only seldom visible, since the text was completely rewritten. Each composition is a unicum with regard to its approach to the Bible and the act of rewriting. The second half of 11QT[a] (cols. LI–LXVI) only changed the biblical text to a small extent (see chapter 2*), while a much greater degree of change is visible in the Jubilees texts from cave 4, 4QExposition on the Patriarchs (4Q464), 4QCommGen (4Q252–254a), and in the various compositions that have the component "apocryphon" or "pseudo-" as part of their title (see *DJD* XIII, XIX, XXII).

A major question that needs to be asked with regard to these rewritten texts is whether or to what extent their writers or readers considered them to be authoritative biblical texts. The modern nomenclature "rewritten biblical text" seems to exclude the possibility that these texts were considered authoritative, but we are not certain that this was the case in each instance.[4] Possibly the author or readers

[2] See chapter 4*.

[3] See ibid.

[4] For a discussion, see M. J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?," *Textus* 22 (2005) 169–96 (p. 181: "One person's reworked Bible is another's Bible"); F. García Martínez, "Las fronteras de 'lo Bíblico'," *Scripta Theologica* 23

of such a text, or both, considered the rewritten text to be authoritative, for example Jubilees and 11QT[a]. This possibility can neither be proven nor disproved, but there is nothing intrinsically wrong with the assumption that one or more of the mentioned texts were considered as authoritative as texts that we consider to be authoritative biblical manuscripts. It has, for example, been noticed that in the Qumran community writings, the books of the Torah and most of the books of the Prophets are quoted as authoritative Scripture,[5] together with some of the Hagiographa, and the book of Jubilees. That book is quoted expressly in CD 16:2–3: "As for the exact determination of their times to which Israel turns a blind eye, behold it is strictly defined in the *Book of the Divisions of the Times into their Jubilees and Weeks.*"[6] Besides, fifteen or sixteen copies of this book have been found at Qumran, thus proving that it was popular among the Qumranites. The book is written as authoritative Scripture, with God announcing Israel's future to Moses on Sinai. A similar claim of authority is implicit in the Temple Scroll, in which Israel's laws are rewritten according to biblical pericopes, and Deuteronomy is rewritten in cols. LI–LXVI. It refers to God in the first person thereby lending greater authority to its contents, as compared with the third person used in the Bible. The book is known from five Qumran manuscripts (three from cave 11, and two from cave 4),[7] a number that is probably large enough to assume its popularity at Qumran. It is less clear whether this composition is quoted in the Qumran writings, unless the enigmatic *Sefer he-Hagu* refers to this work.[8]

Against this background, this chapter focuses on the rewriting in some of the authoritative manuscripts of the Bible. We focus on the Torah, because the ancients were more active in the Torah than in the other books.[9]

The rewriting in the pre-Samaritan texts and SP (henceforth: the SP group) has been stressed less in the discussion of rewritten Bible texts. This aspect is analyzed in detail in the following discussion.

(1991–1993) 759–84; J. G. Campbell, "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Ideological Critique," in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10th September 2003* (ed. J. G. Campbell et al.; Library of Second Temple Studies 52; London: T & T Clark International, 2005) 43–68.

[5] For a useful table of these references, see J. C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994) 151–2. For a longer list and an innovative analysis, see A. Lange, "From Literature to Scripture – The Unity and Plurality of the Hebrew Scriptures in Light of the Qumran Library," in *Canon from Biblical, Theological, and Philosophical Perspectives* (ed. C. Helmer and C. Landmesser; Oxford: University Press, 2004) 51–107.

[6] See VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 154 (see n. 5).

[7] 11QT[a,b,c], 4Q365a, and 4Q524.

[8] 4QReworked Pentateuch, published as a rewritten Bible text, probably should be reclassified as an exegetical biblical text and hence need not be mentioned in this context. See chapter 20*, § E and Tov, "Many Forms."

[9] See my study "The Scribal and Textual Transmission of the Torah Analyzed in Light of Its Sanctity," forthcoming.

2. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Pre-Samaritan Texts

While the rewritten Bible texts inserted new elements into the previously known biblical text, the SP group copied existing biblical passages in new locations. In order to highlight the differences between the two types of texts, this feature of the SP group is analyzed here in detail.

Since the pre-Samaritan texts are known only fragmentarily, the analysis of the SP group focuses on SP, with constant reference to the pre-Samaritan texts from Qumran. This procedure is legitimate, since in their editorial changes the members of the SP group are almost identical (see below, § 3). The extensive content editing of the SP group has been analyzed at length by Tigay as background material for the analysis of the documentary hypothesis of the Torah.[10] It is equally relevant to compare SP with the rewritten biblical texts, since the changes of SP that have been presented as harmonizing changes should actually be conceived of as exponents of content editing.[11] This type of editing, which is a form of rewriting, is discussed next, while the following two *caveats* should be kept in mind:

a. In its present form, SP is a sectarian text incorporating the Samaritan belief in the site of Mount Gerizim as the central place of worship. This belief is expressed by the addition of a tenth, "Samaritan" commandment to the Decalogue, enabled by the moving of the first commandment to the Decalogue preamble,[12] and a small change in the centralization formula in the book of Deuteronomy.[13] The sectarian nature of SP seemingly prohibits its objective analysis within the present analysis, but when this very slight sectarian layer is removed, its underlying base can easily be recognized as a pre-sectarian text.

b. The pre-Samaritan Qumran texts are known only fragmentarily, although the preserved fragments give us good insights into the shape of Exodus and Num-

[10] J. H. Tigay, "Conflation as a Redactional Technique," in idem, *Empirical Models*, 53–96.

[11] Harmonizing is indeed an important aspect of the SP group, which adapted several details in the same or parallel stories; see *TCHB*, 88. These harmonizing readings have been considered so central by some scholars, that E. Eshel used this term to characterize the SP group as a whole ("harmonistic texts"), see E. Eshel, "4QDeut^{n} – A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991) 117–54.

[12] The commandment is made up entirely of verses occurring elsewhere in the Torah: Deut 11:29a, Deut 27:2b–3a, Deut 27:4a, Deut 27:5–7, Deut 11:30 – in that sequence in the SP (Exodus and Deuteronomy). The addition includes the reading of the SP in Deut 27:4 with "Mount Gerizim" instead of "Mount Ebal" as in most other texts as the name of the place where the Israelites were commanded to erect their altar after crossing the Jordan.

[13] This change pertains to the frequent Deuteronomic formulation המקום אשר יבחר יהוה, "the site which the Lord *will* choose." This reference to an anonymous site in Palestine actually envisioned Jerusalem, but that city could not be mentioned in Deuteronomy since it had not yet been conquered at the time of Moses' 4 is provided in col. 6 of the t discourse. From the Samaritan perspective, however, Shechem had already been chosen at the time of the patriarchs (Gen 12:6; Gen 33:18–20), so that the future form "*will* choose" needed to be changed to a past form בחר, "*has* chosen." See, e. g., Deut 12:5, 14.

bers, the two most important books for the content rewriting of these texts. The two best-preserved texts, 4QpaleoExod^{m} and 4QNum^{b}, are relatively extensive, and in fact the former is one of the best-preserved biblical texts from Qumran; 4QExod-Lev^{f} is less extensively preserved. The pre-Samaritan text was also used by 4QTest and 4QJub, rendering our knowledge of this group rather firm.

In their major characteristics, the pre-SP texts and SP usually agree against all other textual witnesses (see below, § 3). For the sake of convenience, the analysis will therefore focus on the only complete text in this group, SP, with constant reference to the preserved readings of the pre-SP texts.

We now turn to the central characteristics of the texts under discussion:

a. The SP group reflects a great amount of content editing.

b. The editing involved is of a specific nature, meant to impart a more perfect and internally consistent structure to the text.

c. The editing is inconsistent, that is, certain details were changed, while others, similar in nature, were left untouched.

When trying to formulate the areas in which the SP group inserted changes, we note that the editor was especially attentive to what he considered to be imperfections within units and between units. What disturbed the editor especially was the incongruence – according to a formalistic view of Scripture – between details within and between specific stories. In this regard, special attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially by God, which was repeated when the reviser considered it important.

i. *The story of the ten plagues*. In this story, the SP group harmonized the description of God's commands to Moses and Aaron to warn Pharaoh before each plague by adding a detailed account of their execution. Systematic additions of the execution of these commands are found in Exodus 7–11.[14] These additions are not exclusive to these texts, as shown, for example, by a similar addition in LXX^{Luc} and the Peshitta in 1 Sam 9:3.

ii. *Moses' summarizing speech in Deuteronomy 1–3*. With pedantic precision, the editor compared the details of this speech with the preceding books of the Torah and, where needed, added them in Exodus and Numbers according to a very precise framework of interpretation. For a detailed analysis, see below.

iii. The *genealogical framework of Genesis 11* was streamlined by the addition of summaries of the number of years that each person lived.

iv. *The Decalogue*. Beyond the addition of a further commandment (see n. 12 above), SP (thus also 4QRP^{a} [4Q158] and 4QTest) added a section of laws (Deut

[14] It is characteristic of the style of the biblical narrative to relate commands in great detail, while their fulfillment is mentioned only briefly, with the words "… and he (etc.) did as …" Often in the SP, the execution of such commands is also elaborated on with a repetition of the details of the command. These additions reflect the editorial desire to stress that the command had indeed been carried out. For examples, see chapter 20*, n. 103.

18:15–22) to the account in Deuteronomy that expressly mentioned the giving of that specific law at Sinai (named Horeb in Deuteronomy).

v. Sundry *small segments* were inserted in the text in order to perfect the framework of certain stories.[15]

At the same time, the text could have been exegetically changed in a similar fashion in many additional pericopes that were *not* reworked. It is hard to know why certain units were altered as described above, while others were not, and the only explanation for this phenomenon is the personal taste of the editor. A major area in which the text was not touched is that of the laws, which were, as a rule, not harmonized to one another. Thus, differences between parallel laws were not canceled by harmonizing additions or changes. As in the rabbinic tradition, these differences were accepted as referring to different situations.

By the same token, the second part of Moses' speech in Deuteronomy, chapters 4–11, was not treated in the same way as the first part. While each statement in chapters 1–3 was scrutinized and, when considered necessary, repeated in Exodus and Numbers, this was not done for Deut 5:19–30 nor for the details in chapter 9 with the exception of 9:20, repeated in SP and 4QpaleoExod^{m} in Exod 32:10.

Likewise, in many individual stories no attention was paid to the exact matching of a command with its execution, as was done in the beginning chapters of Exodus. For example, the command at the beginning of Genesis 22 was not repeated in the form of an action. It is unclear why the story of Exodus 7–11 was singled out for such extensive editing. It may well be that the already schematic framework of these chapters encouraged the reviser to greater perfection, while in most other cases such a framework was lacking. However, by the same token, the creation story could have been made more symmetrical in SP by adding the exact execution of each of God's commands.

3. The Reworking of Deuteronomy 1–3 in the SP Group

Together with the story of Exodus 7–11, Moses' first speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 was the single most central issue on which the editor of the SP group focused. Each item in that speech was scrutinized, and if it did not occur explicitly in Exodus or Numbers, it was repeated in the earlier books as foreshadowers of Deuteronomy. The details are recorded in the following table.[16]

---

[15] For examples, see *TCHB*, 88.

[16] The numbering system of the added verses in the SP follows the editions of Tal, *Samaritan Pentateuch* and A. F. von Gall, *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*, vols. I–V (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1914–1918). In both editions, the added verses were given additional numbers, but not in that of Sadaqa, in which the additional verses were marked typographically by printing in a larger font: Sadaqa, *Jewish and Samaritan Version*. According to the additional number

Deut	*Source (speech indicated by italics)*	*Topic*	*Found elsewhere in Torah*	*Added elsewhere in SP*	*Addition in Qumran texts*[17]	*Notes*
1:1–5	Introduction	Georaphic description	—	—		
1:6–8	*Divine speech* on Horeb	The Israelites to leave immediately to conquer Canaan	—	Num 10:10b		Just before the Israelites left Horeb/Sinai
1:9–18	*Moses*	Appointment of judges	Exod 18	Exod 18:24b, 25b	4Qpaleo-Exod^{m}	Duplicates 18:17–26, though not formally
1:19		Travel description	—	—		
1:20–23a	*Moses*	Sending of spies	Num 13	Num 12:16b (before 13:1)	[4QNum^{b}]	Duplicates Num 13, though not formally
1:23b–26		Sending of spies	Num 13	—		
1:27–28	*People*	Complaint about results of spies' mission	Num 14	Num 13:33b (before 14:1)		Duplicates Num 14
1:29–33	*Moses*	Answer to complaint	—	Num 13:33b (before 14:1)		Duplicates Num 14
1:34–40	*Divine*	Peoples' punishment	Num 14:20–35	—		
1:41	*People*	Israelites ascend mountain to fight	Num 14:40	—		
1:42	*Divine*	Israelites told not to fight	Num 14:42–43	Num 14:40b		Duplicates Num 14:42–43, though not formally
1:43–44a		Battle details	Num 14:44–45	—		
1:44b		Battle simile	—	Num 14:45b		
1:45–46		Historical description	Num 20:1	—		
2:1		Israelites encircle Edom	Num 21:4	—		
2:2–6	*Divine*	Israelites told to pass through Edom	—	Num 20:13b	4QNum^{b}	

system, the additional verse is denoted below as "b," and the existing one as "a," e. g. Num 10:10a in the edition of the SP equals 10:10 of MT, while 10:b is the additional verse of the SP (that is, a plus in the SP based on the MT of Deut 1:6–8). We follow Tal's numbering system that differs in one detail from that of von Gall. In the latter edition, in some cases the additional verse was named "a" when it preceded an existing verse named "b." Thus, in von Gall's edition, the added verse in the SP to Num 14:41a (= MT of Deut 1:42) has been placed before 14:42 which was named 14:42b.

[17] When this column is empty, no evidence is available for the fragmentary Qumran scrolls. Negative evidence (that is, when a scroll does not reflect an addition found in the SP) is indicated explicitly. Reconstructed evidence is included in square brackets.

Deut	*Source (speech indicated by italics)*	*Topic*	*Found elsewhere in Torah*	*Added elsewhere in SP*	*Addition in Qumran texts*	*Notes*
2:7	*Divine*	(Same topic continued)	—	[not in SP]	(not in 4QNum[b])	
2:8		Israelites move to Moab	Num 21:11	—		
2:9	*Divine*	Israelites told not to trouble Moab	—	Num 21:11b	4QNum[b]	
2:10–12		Historical digression	—	—		
2:13	*Divine*	Israelites told to pass Zered	Num 21:12	—		
2:14–16		Historical digression	—	—		
2:17–19	*Divine*	Israelites told not to pass through Ammon	—	Num 21:12b	4QNum[b]	
2:20–23		Historical digression	—	—		
2:24–25	*Divine*	Israelites told to pass over Arnon and start war	—	Num 21:20b	4QNum[b]	
2:26–27	*People*	Israelites ask to pass through Sihon's territory	Num 21:21–22	Num 21:22b (partial)		
2:28–29	*People*	Israelites ask to buy food from Sihon	—	Num 21:22b	[4QNum[b]]	
2:30		Sihon refused request	Num 21:23	—		
2:31	*Divine*	Promise to give Sihon into the Israelites' hands	—	Num 21:23b	[4QNum[b]]	
2:32–37		Israelites win victory over Moab	Num 21:24–26	—		
3:1–7		Defeat of Og	Num 21:33–35	—		
3:8–13		Historical digression	Num 21:24–25, 33–35	—		
3:14–17		Territory allotted to two-and-a-half tribes	Num 32:41	—		
3:18–20	*Moses*	Two-and-a-half tribes told to assist brethren in Canaan conquest	Num 32: 17,20,21	—		
3:21–22	*Moses*	Encouragement to Joshua	—	Num 27:23b	4QNum[b]	
3:23–26	*Moses*	Request to enter Israel	—	Num 20:13b		

Deut	*Source (speech indicated by italics)*	*Topic*	*Found elsewhere in Torah*	*Added elsewhere in SP*	*Addition in Qumran texts*	*Notes*
3:27–28	*Divine*	Negative answer	—	—		
3:29		Israelites remain in Beth Peʿor	—	—		

Analysis

The treatment of Deuteronomy 1–3 in the SP group is based on the understanding of its components by the author of that group. With the exception of the first five verses, chapters 1–3 are phrased as a speech by Moses, but within that speech a distinction can be made between:

1. an account of events;
2. direct quote of speeches by Moses;
3. direct quote of speeches by God;
4. historical and geographical digressions.

The reviser of the text in the SP group focused on the first three chapters of Deuteronomy that, in his mind, should have reflected an exact summary of the events and speeches described in the earlier books. Special attention was paid to the spoken words, mostly those of God and Moses, recorded in these three chapters. As a rule, these spoken words are not matched exactly by the stories in Exodus and Numbers, but even if they are somehow reflected, they were repeated in the SP group, which expected a verbatim repetition in the biblical text. Thus, the story of the appointment of the judges (Deut 1:9–18) was repeated in the middle of verses 24 and 25 of Exodus 18 since the details of the two stories differed. In other cases in which the spoken words were not matched by the text of Exodus and Numbers, they were repeated in the appropriate places in these books from Deuteronomy. This pertains to all the spoken words in these chapters, with the exception of Deut 2:7, continuing 2:2–6, and of all other sections that, in the editor's view, did not need to be repeated, that is the introduction (vv 1–5) and several narrative details that do not contain speeches.[18]

[18]

MT	*Topic*
1:19	Travel from Horeb to Qadesh Barnea
1:23b–26	Sending of the spies
1:43–44a	Details of the battle
1:44b	Simile of the battle
1:45–46	Historical description
2:1	The Israelites encircle Edom
2:8	The Israelites move to Moab
2:10–12	Historical digression
2:14–16	Historical digression
2:20–23	Historical digression

Some of these sections were not repeated, possibly because they were covered somehow by narratives in Exodus and Numbers.

Basically, the editor's technique was to repeat sections from Moses' speech in Deuteronomy in the previous books of the Torah as foreshadowers of Deuteronomy. When the account of Deuteronomy was repeated in the SP of Exodus and Numbers, it often created a peculiar duplication that was rather unusual from a literary point of view. The duplication created is usually not impossible at the content level, as the reviser took care to ascribe the parallel sections to different speakers (e. g., God/Moses), but in one case a rather "impossible" text was created (Num 13:33b together with Numbers 14; see below). Several details are mentioned in the "*Notes*" column in the table as "duplications."[19]

2:30	Sihon refused request
2:32–37	The Israelites win a victory over Moab
3:1–7	Defeat of Og
3:8–13	Historical digression
3:14–17	Territory allotted to two-and-a-half tribes
3:29	The Israelites remain in Beth Pe'or

[19] *Deut 1:9–18 = Exod 18:24b, 25b SP.*

The two versions of the story of the appointment of the judges in Deuteronomy 1 and Exodus 19 differ in several details:

1. In Exodus, the idea to appoint judges originated with Jethro, while in Deuteronomy it was suggested by Moses.
2. The requirements for the ideal judge differ in the two texts (cf. Exod 19:21 with Deut 1:13); in Exodus they stress ethical virtues, and in Deuteronomy intellectual qualities.
3. The appointment of the judges precedes the theophany at Sinai in Exodus, while in Deuteronomy it follows that event.

On a formal level, the story is not told twice in Exodus 18 in the SP, since the main story of Exodus in that version presents the proposal of Jethro, while the supplement from Deuteronomy relates the executing of Jethro's advice.

Deut 1:20–23a = Num 12:16b SP

The added section from Deuteronomy contains Moses' words to the people describing the dispatching of the spies, starting with his command to send them off, and continuing with the people's agreement to the mission. This account runs parallel to the next section in Numbers 13, which starts all over again: God's command to Moses to send spies (13:1–20) and the executing of the command (13:21–33). On a formal level, there is no duplication, since Deut 1:20–23a = Num 12:16b SP reflects the words of Moses to the people and Num 13:1 ff. contains the words of God to Moses.

Deut 1:27–33 = Num 13:33b SP

The addition of this section at the end of Numbers 13 created a direct duplication of the content of the next chapter. The addition in Num 13:33b contains the complaints of the Israelites after the gloomy report of the spies (Deut 1:27–28) together with Moses' words of encouragement to the people, stating that God will help them (Deut 1:29–33). However, the next section contains exactly the same episodes: the Israelites complain again (Num 14:1–4), and listen to Moses' reassuring words (Num 14:5–9), as if these episodes had not been described at the end of the previous chapter. This repetition, and hence duplication, created a very unusual situation at the literary level.

Deut 1: 42 = Num 14:40b SP

Sequence

The reviser took pains to place the repeated sections in exactly the right position in the narrative in Exodus and Numbers. Since Moses' speech in Deuteronomy more or less followed a historical sequence, the reworker's task was not too difficult, but at times his special skills and knowledge of the biblical text are especially noteworthy.

As in other cases, the reviser was especially sensitive to words that, according to the text, had been uttered at Sinai and were not recorded precisely in the present biblical text. Thus, when Deut 1:6–8 says: "The Lord our God spoke to us at Horeb saying: You have stayed long enough at this mountain. Start out and make your way to the hill country of the Amorites … ," SP took care to repeat the exact content of these verses in Num 10:10b. The reviser could have repeated this section in Exodus, but he probably wanted to place it in the pericope in which it would be most relevant and powerful, namely before the verses that relate the moving from Horeb, viz., vv 11–12 ("In the second year … the Israelites set out on their journey from the wilderness of Sinai"). In actual fact, while Deuteronomy speaks of Horeb, Numbers mentions Sinai, but the reviser realized that the same place was intended.[20]

Thus, when following the sequence of the verses in Numbers and Exodus in which the reviser had inserted the duplicated sections, we note in col. 5 of the

---

The added verse in the SP of Num, 14:40b, deriving from Deut 1:42, creates a duplication with Num 14:42–43, but on a formal level there is no duplication, since the added verse in SP, 14:40b, reports God's words, while the repetition records Moses' words repeating those of God.

During the course of his reworking, the editor had to change the wording slightly, since in Deuteronomy 1–3, Moses spoke in the first person, while in the other chapters he was often mentioned in the third person. The reviser therefore slightly rewrote the original text, for example:

Source	MT Deut 1:9	ואמר אלכם
Rewritten text	SP Exod 18:24a	ויאמר משה אל העם
Source	MT Deut 1:23	וייטב בעיני הדבר
Rewritten text	SP Num 12:16b	וייטב הדבר בעיני משה

This type of rewriting reminds us of the Temple Scroll, which contains changes in the reverse direction. That text was rephrased in the first person, as if it contains the word of God, rendering it necessary to rephrase all biblical utterances in the third person referring to God in the first person (cf. chapter 2*). For example,

Source	MT Deut 20:17	שנה בשנה במקום אשר יבחר יהוה
Rewritten text	11QT[a] LII 9	שנה בשנה במקום אשר אבחר
Source	MT Deut 20:17	כאשר צוך יהוה אלהיך
Rewritten text	11QT[a] LXII 15	כאשר צויתיכה

[20] Likewise, on another occasion, when the text of Deut 18:16 read: "This is just what you asked of the Lord your God at Horeb … ," the next verses, too, had to be added at an appropriate place in the story since the preserved story actually did not contain this utterance. Indeed, Deut 18:18–22 was repeated appropriately in the heart of the story of the Sinai revelation itself, as Exod 20:18b, though not in Deuteronomy. This section was likewise placed at this point in 4QRP[a] (4Q158), frg. 6, lines 6–9 and 4QTest lines 5–8.

table that with the exception of the aforementioned Exod 18:25a, he followed the sequence of the chapters in Numbers, with some exceptions.[21]

The reviser knew his biblical text well, and therefore the appointment of the judges (Deut 1:9–18) had to be added out of sequence in Exodus 18. Likewise, the last item in the speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 (Deut 3:23–26), Moses' request to enter Canaan, was repeated in a different place in Numbers, in conjunction with the story of the Waters of Meribah. In Deuteronomy, this request was inserted after the people had finished encircling Edom and had conquered Moab. This is a logical place for the request, just preceding the entering of Canaan. However, in SP a different logic is reflected. In the SP of Num 20:13b, the section is placed after the description of Moses' sin at the Waters of Meribah, where he had shown insufficient trust in the Lord and was therefore punished by not being allowed to enter Canaan. This placement of the addition shows that the editor was a very attentive reader and exegete; he considered this a more appropriate place for Moses' special request.

The preserved fragments of 4QNum^{b} and 4QpaleoExod^{m} include all the sections repeated in SP in the same places. This evidence is provided in col. 6 of the table. In all instances, the preserved evidence of the two Qumran scrolls agrees with SP, while in three cases, 4QNum^{b} can be reconstructed as having contained such an addition. The text of that scroll is well preserved and enables the reconstruction of the number of lines in each column.

The nature of the exegesis behind the addition of the verses in the SP group in Exodus and Numbers is such that it probably ought to be conceived of as the work of a single person and not of a school or textual family. The few instances mentioned above, in which the editor deviated from the verse sequence, show the personal involvement of an individual, which is reflected in more than one textual source. It seems that a single text, reflecting the work of an individual, must be assumed at the base of the SP texts.

4. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Rewritten Bible Compositions

The so-called rewritten Bible compositions do not form a well-defined group; they have in common a reworking of an existing Scripture text. In the case of the Temple Scroll, this is a text of an independent nature, and in the case of Jubilees,

[21] The following additional verses are found in the text of Exodus and Numbers in the SP based on segments derived from Deuteronomy 1–3 (italics indicate special cases): Num 10:10b; *Exod 18:24b, 25b*; Num 12:16b (before 13:1); Num 13:33b (before 14:1); Num 14:40b; Num 14:45b; Num 20:13b; Num 21:11b; Num 21:12b; Num 21:20b; Num 21:22b; Num 21:23b; Num 27:23b; *Num 20:13b*.

it is a text close to the SP group.[22] Neither the purpose of the reworking nor the *Sitz im Leben* of these texts or their authoritative status is always clear. Some compositions deviate only minimally from the biblical text, while others differ substantially.

In the latter half of the Temple Scroll,[23] long stretches of biblical text are presented with only minor changes from the majority text. In fact, it is often almost impossible to decide whether small fragments found at Qumran contained a biblical text or a rewritten biblical composition.[24]

The main focus of this study is an analysis of the SP group as a rewritten Bible text. The analysis shows that the distinction between the various texts is difficult, since the SP group displays all the features of a rewritten Bible text, yet has been accepted among the authoritative Scripture texts. What the rewritten Bible compositions and the SP group have in common is the interaction of stretches of Scripture text with exegetical expansions, although these expansions differ in nature and tendency. An early rewritten Bible text, Chronicles, was included in the Hebrew and Greek canon. Not all communities accepted some of these literary reformulations. Thus, some of them made their way to the Jewish LXX translators (the presumed source of the LXX of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel),[25] but not to the collection of MT. Other texts circulating in ancient Israel made

---

[22] For the former, see my study "The Temple Scroll and Old Testament Textual Criticism," *ErIsr* 16 (Harry M. Orlinsky Volume) (ed. B. A. Levine and A. Malamat; Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1982) 100–11; for the latter, see the argumentation of J. C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977) 136–8.

[23] The Temple Scroll contains large sections that provide a running text of Deuteronomy with few differences from MT, e. g., 11QT[a], cols. LX 10–LXIV 6, as well as other stretches of text in which the main difference from the canonical text of the Torah is the deviating internal sequence of 11QT[a], e. g., col. LIII 11–14a (Deut 23:22–24), LIII 14b–21 (Num 30:3–6), LIV 1–5a (Num 30:3–14 [different internal sequence]), LIV 5b–21 (Deut 13:1–7), LV 1–14 (Deut 13:13–19), LV 15–21 (Deut 17:2–5), LVI 1–21 (Deut 17:9–18). The various biblical texts are linked to one another by principles of associative connection, as if they reflected an exegetical chain of legal prescriptions. See G. Brin, "Concerning Some of the Uses of the Bible in the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 12 (1987) 519–28. If, as M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990) believes, the mentioned sections in 11QT[a] belonged to a separate source preceding the Temple Scroll, that source would be the closest among the reworked biblical compositions to the biblical text. However, the Temple Scroll also contains sections that consist of a combination of two or more different Torah laws pertaining to a specific issue. For example, col. LII 1–5a combines elements from both Deut 16:22–17:1 and Lev 26:22 with reference to the prohibition of idols, with Deuteronomy serving as the leading text. Furthermore, the Temple Scroll rewrites the content of the biblical text from time to time, freely condensing the often verbose text of Deuteronomy, and altering some of its ideas, such as col. LIII 2–8 rephrasing Deut 12:20–28 and 15–19 and col. XXV 10–12 rephrasing Lev 23:27–29; see further chapter 2*.

[24] As a result, it is unclear whether 2QExod[b] is a biblical manuscript or a fragment of a reworked Bible text (see M. Baillet in *DJD* III). For additional examples of such uncertainty, see chapter 10*.

[25] See chapter 20*.

their way to the Qumran community. 4QReworked Pentateuch, reclassified as a biblical text,[26] may have been considered to be authoritative Scripture by the Qumran community or another group.

[26] See chapter 20*.

Chapter Seven

The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada

Five different fragmentary manuscripts from Qumran and one from Masada are based on the book of Joshua or rewrite that book. The present study cautiously suggests that four, five, or all six of them represent a single composition that is named here an "apocryphon of Joshua." Each of the six manuscripts covers different themes and episodes from the book of Joshua. The coverage, nature, and tendencies of these six manuscripts are described in this study. Much attention is directed at 4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}), which, despite its limited scope, provides the longest continuous stretch of preserved text of the apocryphon of Joshua. In the past, the name "apocryphon of Joshua" was given to 4Q378 and 4Q379 by Newsom (see below), and we suggest that this name be assigned to another two, three, or four texts, totaling four, five, or six texts altogether. The term "apocryphon" is probably not the most appropriate for this composition and, in fact, a name such as "paraphrase of Joshua" would be more appropriate. However, as the term apocryphon is in use in the literature, we decline to change it.

Initially, a link is established between 4Q378, 4Q379, and 4Q522, named or renamed 4QapocrJosh^{a,b,c}. At a second stage, this group of three manuscripts is expanded to include a fourth, 5Q9 (5QapocrJosh?, published as "Ouvrage avec toponymes"). The link with that text is made through the contents of the list of geographical names in 4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}) 9 i (and other fragments), due to the similar form of both lists and their mentioning of Joshua. This group of four documents is then expanded to six, but with a lesser degree of certainty due to the fragmentary nature of the two additional documents, MasParaJosh (= Mas apocrJosh?) and 4QpaleoParaJosh (= 4Qpaleo apocrJosh^{d}?).

The *Assumption of Moses*, also known as the *Testament of Moses to Joshua,* containing a long farewell speech by Moses to Joshua, is a related work, though not connected with this apocryphon.

I. 4Q378–379 (4QapocrJosh^{a,b})

Two copies of a composition rewriting the book of Joshua have been preserved, albeit very fragmentarily, and were published by Newsom.[1]

[1] C. Newsom, *DJD* XXII, 237–88.

Many of the fragments of 4Q378–379 reflect speeches, blessings, and prayers by Joshua not contained in the biblical book. These sections in 4Q378–379 are built on the model of Joshua's speeches in chapters 1, 18–21, and 23–24, and also on those of Moses in Deuteronomy chapters 1–3 and 28–31. 4Q522 contains a similar speech by Joshua probably delivered not far from Jerusalem.

4Q378 (4QapocrJosh[a]; previously named 4QpssJosh[a]), dating to the Herodian period, covers the earlier part of Joshua's life. It probably started off with the Israelites' mourning for Moses (frg. 14), and contained an account of the transferal of leadership from Moses to Joshua (frg. 3). Several other fragments contain speeches of Joshua to the people (cf. Joshua's speeches scattered throughout the biblical book, especially in chapters 18–21). The incident of Achan (Joshua 7) is probably described in frg. 6 i, the ruse of the Gibeonites (Joshua 9) in frg. 22, Joshua's restraining of the sun (chapter 10) in frg. 26 (cf. especially line 5), and a summary of the conquests in accordance with God's plan (Josh 21:42–43) in frg. 11. The covenant with the patriarchs is mentioned three times (11 3; 14 4; 22 i 4). It is noteworthy that the *Assumption of Moses*, also known as the *Testament of Moses to Joshua*, also refers frequently to this covenant (e. g., 3:9; 4:5).

4Q379 (4QapocrJosh[b]), dating to the Hasmonean period, follows the biblical text of the book of Joshua more closely. It contains a description of the crossing of the Jordan (frg. 12 and probably additional fragments) and of the curse pronounced on the rebuilder of Jericho (Josh 6:26), together with a prophetic vision of the identity of that rebuilder (frg. 22 ii). The blessings mentioned in frgs. 15–16 reflect the ceremony on or opposite Mt. Gerizim (Josh 8:30–35), even though Newsom connects it with the crossing of the Jordan (chapter 3) and the assembly at Gilgal (chapters 4–5). A summary of Joshua's victories over the inhabitants of Canaan is reflected in frg. 3 (parallel to Joshua 13). Frg. 17 probably reflects Joshua's final speech (cf. line 4 with Josh 24:4–5).

II. 4Q522 (4QapocrJosh[c])

The thirteen fragments of 4Q522, the largest of which was numbered frg. 9 i–ii by Puech,[2] were dated to the mid-first century BCE by Puech, 689. All the fragments reflect the same handwriting, including three fragments containing parts of Psalm 122.[3] In light of the following discussion, it would probably be best to rename all the fragments of 4Q522 as 4QapocrJosh[c], based on the model of 4QapocrJosh[a,b]

[2] É. Puech, "La pierre de Sion et l'autel des holocaustes d'après un manuscrit hébreu de la grotte 4 (4Q522)," *RB* 99 (1992) 676–96, finalized in *DJD* XXV. In the original study, this fragment was named "frg. 9," but Puech's revised numbering system (*DJD* XXV) is followed here. Otherwise, reference is made to Puech's article.

[3] The name given to 4Q522 in Tov–Pfann, *Companion Volume*, "Work with Place Names," is imprecise since it only pertains to col. i of frg. 9.

with which 4Q522 has several elements and motifs in common. This composition was previously named "La pierre de Sion" (Puech, *RB* 99), "Prophétie de Josué (4QApocrJosué?)" (Puech, *DJD* XXV), and "Joshua Cycles" (Qimron).

The left column of the largest fragment, frg. 9 ii, was published preliminarily by Puech in 1992 and described by him as dealing with "David and his son as well as the temple and tabernacle." This topic was, according to Puech, the reason for the inclusion of the "Jerusalem Psalm," Psalm 122, in that composition. The same scholar published the three fragments containing parts of that Psalm in 1978.[4] The 1992 study by Puech also contains a long exposition on the Rock of Zion and the place of the altar. An ancient text focusing on these issues would not be out of place in the Qumran corpus, in which we find, for example, 4QFlor containing a *pesher* dealing with the building of the temple. That text was renamed 4QMidrEschat[a] by Steudel, and joined with other fragments that according to Steudel belonged to the same composition.[5]

Reacting to this publication, Qimron republished the text of frg. 9 ii with several new readings and reconstructions, all based on the photograph that also formed the basis for Puech's work (PAM 43.606).[6] Qimron proposed a completely different interpretation of this column, describing it as a fragment of a treatise dealing with what he named "Joshua Cycles." In this interpretation, Qimron was actually preceded by Eisenman and Wise (not mentioned by Qimron), who were probably the first to recognize the true meaning of this document.[7] A comparison of the publications by Puech and Qimron is a veritable exercise in the method of comparing the exegesis of small Qumran fragments in which scholars necessarily read much into the lacunae. While adopting Qimron's view, we advance the discussion of this and other fragments of 4Q522, suggesting that they are part of 4QapocrJosh, that is, 4QapocrJosh[c] in our nomenclature. We also attempt to analyze the theology and background of this composition.

The descriptions of frg. 9 ii by Puech and Qimron are very different, and therefore one should first try to locate the identifiable elements in this column. Most of these elements pertain exclusively to the figures of David and Solomon, the temple, and the Jebusites (hence Puech's explanation). In Puech's explanation, they feature as the central elements of this document, while for Qimron they are a mere digression in a document containing the memoirs of Joshua. Indeed, only a few of the identifiable elements pertain exclusively to the period of Joshua. In the course of our analysis, the other fragments of 4Q522 are also taken into consideration.

---

[4] É. Puech, "Fragments du Psaume 122 dans un manuscrit hébreu de la grotte IV," *RevQ* 9 (1978) 547–54.

[5] Steudel, *Der Midrasch*.

[6] E. Qimron, "Concerning 'Joshua Cycles' from Qumran," *Tarbiz* 63 (1995) 503–8 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

[7] R.H. Eisenman and M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element, 1992) 89–93.

According to Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 4Q522 contains a midrashic prophecy by God, with apocalyptic and messianic elements, addressed to the prophet Nathan, the seer Samuel, or the seer Gad, in the third and first person (Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 690). In the main, this prophecy is based on 1–2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles, although to some extent it also continues 4Q378–379. Although Puech was aware of some links between 4Q522 and the period of Joshua, he nevertheless related it more to the period of David and Solomon, and made reconstructions accordingly (see the reconstructed lacunae in lines 4, 6, 8, 12, 13).

A note on the reconstructions is in order. Puech's reconstructions presuppose a much longer line length than those of Qimron. Qimron based the shortness of his reconstructions on the preserved text of lines 9–10, in which probably only a single word needs to be reconstructed following the extant text (Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 505). We concur with this view for lines 9–10 but not with regard to the other lines. The printed reconstruction is probably somewhat misleading. The photograph shows that the last preserved word of line 9, והכנענ֯י, as well as those of the adjacent lines is far to the left of the remnants of the other lines. Even if only a single word were to be added at the ends of these two lines, we need to extend the reconstruction of the other lines to more or less the same point. Therefore, Qimron's reconstruction of several lines is too short (lines 11–14, and probably also lines 2, 3). For yet a different edition, "based on PAM 41.948 and PAM 43.606, and the respective editions of Puech and Qimron," see Dimant, "*Apocryphon*," 183.

4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^c) 9 ii[8]

1 [ ]○○○[ ]
2 ל֯ו֯א [נו]כ֯ל לבוא לצי]ו֯ן להשכין שם את אהל֯ מ֯ו֯ע֯]ד עד קץ]
3 העתים כי הנה בן נולד לישי בן פרץ בן יה]ודה]וילכוד]
4 את סלע ציון ויורש משם את ^כל^האמורי פ֯נ֯]לוא יניחוהו]
5 לבנות ^את^הבית ליהוה אלוה֯י ישראל זהב וכסף] ונחושת יכין]
6 ארזים וברושים יב֯י֯א [מ]ל֯בנו֯ן לבנותו ובנו הק֯טן֯]יבננו וצדוק]
7 יכהן שם ראי֯שו֯ן֯ מן]ח֯ס֯]ד יבואנו] ואות֯ו֯ [יר]צ֯ה ו֯]יברכהו]
8 [מן המ]ע֯ון מן השמי]ם כי]ידיד יהו]ה] ישכון לבטח ו]כול]
9 [ה]י֯מים עמו ישכון ל֯ע֯ד ועתה האמורי שם והכנע֯נ֯י בהר]
10 יושב אשר החטיונ֯י֯ אשר לוא דרשתי א֯]ת מ]שפט֯ ה֯]אורים]
11 מאתכה והשלוני והנ]נ֯]ה֯ נ֯תתיו עבד ע]ולם ליש]ר֯א]ל? [
12 ועתה נ]ש]כינה את א]הל מו]עד רחוק מן ה֯]כנעני בשלה וישאו]
13 אלעזר֯] וישו]ע את א֯]הל מו]עד מבית]אל לשלה [
14 ישוע֯] ש]ר֯ צבא מע֯]רכות ישראל [
15 ○ ש]]ל]]ל]]ל] [

[8] With a few exceptions, the text reproduced here follows the reconstruction of Qimron. For further reconstructions, see H. Eshel, "A Note on a Recently Published Text: The 'Joshua Apocryphon'," in *The Centrality of Jerusalem – Historical Perspectives* (ed. M. Poorthuis and Ch. Safrai; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996) 89–93 and Dimant, "*Apocryphon*," 183.

4. פֹּן]ולוא The remains of the letters on the leather do not seem to fit this reconstruction.

7. חסֹנד יבואנו[The remains of the letters on the leather do not seem to fit this reconstruction.

1. Exclusive connection with David and Solomon

3. כי הנה בן נולד לישי בן פרץ בן יהו[ודה. This phrase exclusively reflects the period of David and Solomon, although it does not necessarily imply that the composition pertains to that period. If the phrase is translated as "behold, a son *will* be born …," it could reflect a prophetic vision of what is to happen generations later. Thus J. T. Milik in *DJD* III, 179 and Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 506. On the other hand, if the phrase is translated as "for behold, a son *was* born to Jesse son of Peretz son of Ju]dah" (Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 678: "un fils est né à Jessé"), the phrase must be connected exclusively with the period of David and Solomon.

A parallel for the understanding of הנה as referring to a future event (thus Milik and Qimron) is provided by Joshua's prophecy in 4Q175, line 23: אנה (= הנה) איש ארור אחד בליעל עומד להיות פו]ח י[קוש (behold a cursed man, one of Belial, has arisen to be a fow[ler's t]rap).

4. את סלע ציון[. "… the rock of Zion." This phrase, otherwise unknown from the Bible, probably refers to the mountain area that David bought from Aravna (Samuel)/Ornan (Chronicles) the Jebusite, on which he planned to establish the temple (2 Sam 24:18–24; 1 Chr 21:18–22). The reconstruction at the end of the preceding line probably contained a verb such as וילכוד (Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 505), for which cf. Num 21:32, 32:39 and 2 Sam 5:7 or ויקח (Puech, "Pierre de Sion").

4. ויורש משם את כ]ל האמורי. "and he [*scil*. David] expelled from there all the Amorites." For the phrase, cf. Num 21:32, but the situation is that of the expulsion of the Jebusites from Jerusalem by David, described in 2 Sam 5:6–9.

5.]לבנות את בית ליהוה אלוהי ישראל זהב וכסף[. "to build the temple for the Lord, God of Israel, (made of) gold and silver." This phrase, referring to the building of the temple, does not occur exactly in this way in the Bible, but for similar formulations, cf. 1 Chr 22:6; 1 Kgs 5:17, 19; 8:17, 20, all referring to David. The similar phrase in 2 Chr 3:1 refers to Solomon. Since David did not actually build the temple, a task later accomplished by Solomon, the key to the understanding of this phrase must be sought in the lacuna at the end of the previous line, 4. The contents of that lacuna, together with the reading of the last two letters on the line, differ in Puech's and Qimron's reconstructions, but both of them assume that David is the subject of the verb at the beginning of line 5.

6.]ארזים וברושים יב[א מן]לבנון לבנותו. "He will bring [from] Lebanon cedars and cypresses to build it." For David's preparations for the building of the temple, see especially 1 Kgs 5:20, 22; 1 Chr 22:4.

6. ובנו הקטן]. "and his little son." In this context, after the mentioning of David, this phrase undoubtedly referred to Solomon, who was to build the temple (cf. 1 Chr 22:5; 2 Chr 6:9).

8. ידיד יהו[ה ישכון לבטח ע[. "the beloved of the Lo[rd] will dwell safely and[." The phrase refers to Solomon, who is described as the beloved of God (ידידיה) in 2 Sam 12:24–25. Puech refers to Sir 47:12, where a similar phrase is applied to Solomon: שלמה מלך בימי שלוה ואֵל הניח לו מסביב.

The aforementioned elements were accepted by both scholars as exclusively connected with the period of David and Solomon. Zion is mentioned in line 2 and "the rock of Zion" in line 4. David expels the Amorites from Zion (line 4) and lines 5–6 describe in detail the building of the temple by David's son, Solomon.

As a result, there are rather compelling reasons for connecting the column as a whole with the period of David and Solomon, as suggested by Puech, but there are a few details in the text that are questionable in this context and that lead to a different explanation.

2. Connection with any period

Some elements in the text fit any period in the history of Israel.

2. לציון.

2. להשכין שם את אהל מועד. "to set up there the Tent of Meeting." This phrase, which recurs in line 12 (see below), may refer to several periods in the history of Israel, from the time of Moses until the period of the Israelite kings. At the same time, the combination of השכין in the *hiph'il* or in another conjugation and the "Tent of Meeting" occurs only in Josh 18:1, where it is used with regard to the setting up of the tent of meeting at Shiloh: וישכינו שם את אהל מועד. In the present context, however, "there" refers to Jerusalem (Zion), where for various reasons the Tent of Meeting could not be established, and the reasons are specified later on in the text.

7. יכהן שם ראישון מן. "he will officiate there first." The subject of the verb, which is crucial for the understanding of the context, was found in the lacuna at the end of the previous line, reconstructed by Puech as either Solomon or David, and by Qimron as Zadok, David's priest who brought the ark from Qiryat Yearim to Jerusalem (2 Sam 15:24–37). The verb refers to the religious officiating of priests, which could include Zadok, and by extension also David, who sacrified offerings at the altar of Aravna in 2 Sam 24:25, and Solomon.

14. שר צבא מערכות ישראל. The phrase שר צבא could fit several persons; the longer phrase, as reconstructed by Qimron, fits Joshua (cf. 5:14, 15).

3. Absence of connection to David and Solomon

While the above-mentioned details in 4Q522 9 ii refer to the period of David and Solomon, the detail listed below does not. By the same token, it is hard to

find a link between the period of David and Solomon and the list of geographical names in col. i of that document. Likewise, the details mentioned in section (4), positively linking 4Q522 with the book of Joshua, negatively affect their connection with the period of David and Solomon.

9. ועתה האמורי שם והכנענ[י. "but now the Amorite is there and the Canaani[te." It is unclear why 4Q522 would stress that during the period of David and Solomon the Amorites and the Canaanites were *now* there, for they had been there since time immemorial. Because of this difficulty, it seems that this phrase does not refer to the period of David and Solomon. According to Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 687, this phrase introduces a new topic "relating to another aspect of the presence of Israel in the midst of the indigenous peoples of the land, most probably including Jerusalem." But the connection between the different issues in 4Q522 is very clear. In line 4, the speaker says that in the future David will expel the Amorites, but he reminds the listeners that at this juncture the Amorites and Canaanites are present in the land.

4. Exclusive connection with Joshua and the book of Joshua

Several details in the text refer exclusively to the period and book of Joshua.

12. ועתה נ[ש]כינה את אהל מו[עד רחוק מן ת֯ן. "and now let us set up the Ten[t of Mee]ting far away from … [." The minute remains of the last word were read by Puech as a *qoph* yielding a restoration קֿ[ריה יערים, and by Qimron as a *he*, yielding a restoration ה[כנעני. Even though the connection of the preceding lines with the period of David and Solomon is obvious, it is rather difficult to explain this phrase within the framework of that period in view of the words, "far away from …" Since the Tent of Meeting was located in what was to become the center of the empire, why would that locality be described as being far away from something or someone? On the other hand, the cultic actions of Joshua occurred far away from places that afterwards were considered central. Line 12 could therefore be understood in light of line 9 ועתה האמורי שם והכנענ[י, "but now the Amorite is there and the Canaani[te," as referring to the distance ("far away") from these peoples. It therefore seems that because of the presence of the Amorites and Canaanites in Jerusalem, Joshua (partial subject of the first verb in line 12, נ[ש]כינה) realized that he had to move the center of the cult temporarily far away from Jerusalem.

The phrase used in line 12 as well as in line 2, that occurs in the Bible only in Josh 18:1 with regard to the installing of the Tent of Meeting at Shiloh, וישכינו שם את אהל מועד, "they installed there the Tent of Meeting," further strengthens the connection with the book of Joshua. 4Q522 used exactly the same phrase for the setting up of the Tent of Meeting in an unnamed place, probably Shiloh, to be read in the lacuna at the end of line 12. Qimron's reconstruction does not include any name at this place in the lacuna, but such a name is necessary. Firstly,

since the next line mentions the moving of the Tent of Meeting from Beth[el] to another location (mentioned in the lacuna at the end of line 13), that location would probably have been mentioned in Joshua's speech. Secondly, the reconstructed line 12 would be too short if no name appeared in the lacuna (cp. the length of the reconstructed lines 9 and 10, the longest preserved lines, for which a plausible reconstruction was suggested, with line 12). A parallel to the text of line 12 appears in 4Q379 26 2–3, on which see below.

13. אלעזר̇[. "Eleazar." This name, preserved without any context, probably represents the most disconcerting element in Puech's explanation; he regards this Eleazar as the son of Abinadab (read in the lacuna in line 13) of Qiryat Yearim (read in the lacuna in line 12). Indeed, an Eleazar son of Abinadab was made custodian of the ark in 2 Sam 7:1. However, it is more logical to interpret this name as the well-known figure of Eleazar in light of Qimron's plausible reading of אלעזר̇ [וישו]ע in this line, and even more so because of the occurrence of the name of Joshua in the next line. It should further be remembered that the related document 4Q379 17 5 also mentions Eleazar.

14. The first word of the line is ישוע̇[, which, however, was read by Puech as ישוע̇[ת ישראל]. A corroborating argument for reading here the name of Joshua is the occurrence of the same name as והיה ישוע[in 5Q9, a document whose list of geographical names resembles the list of the names in 4Q522 9 i. Note that 4Q378 22 i 2–3 also refer to Joshua as ישוע.

The latter details in particular are not compatible with the view that the document as a whole is connected with the period of David and Solomon. The references to David and Solomon should therefore be viewed as a digression within a text connected with Joshua.

There are two further groups of supporting evidence that strengthen the position that 4Q522 pertains to Joshua.

α. *4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}) 9 i and small fragments*

a. The list of geographical names preceding frg. 9 ii is connected with the person and book of Joshua (thus without details, Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 507). Three of the small fragments in photograph PAM 43.606 and frg. 9 i contain a list or lists of geographical names all of which immediately precede col ii. Because of its position in the scroll, this list must have had some relevance to the speech in col. ii. This relevance seems to be remote if the fragment is ascribed to the period of David and Solomon, but is very pertinent to the book of Joshua, which contains many long lists of geographical names.

The list in frg. 9 i and the smaller fragments can be subdivided into two groups of data: (1) a list of localities, partly within tribal territories, probably presented as conquered by Joshua; and (2) areas that had not been conquered by Joshua.

(1) *Lists of localities, partly within tribal territories*

The nearly complete names in this column are based on my own readings, improving on those of Eisenman-Wise and García Martínez:[9]

1. ʿAin Qeber[
2. Baki?, Beth Zippor
3. the whole valley of Miṣwa'
4. Heykhalim, Yaʿapur
5. Makku, ʿAin Kober
6. Ḥaduta', ʿAi of …
7. [Ma]don which is …
8. Ashqelon
9. Galil and two … [ ]? of the Sharon
10. [for/in Ju]dah: Be'er Sheba [and] Beʿalot
11. Qeʿilah, ʿAdullam
12. Gezer, Temni, Gimzon
13. ?]ḥiqqar, Qiṭr[on] and 'Efranim, the fields of …
14. Upper and Lower Beth-Ḥoron
15. Upper and Lower Gulot

The wording of frg. 2 3 also reminds us of the tribal lists in Joshua, as it contains a standard formula in the description of borders (cf. e. g. Josh 15:3):]ר אשר[ ]יצאו.

Frg. 4 2 contains a phrase]ל ומחציתם מן[, reminding us of Josh 21:25 וממחצית מטה מנשה, and probably referring to half of the tribe of Manasseh.

The list in frg. 9 i mentions names of places, all of them preceded by את or ואת. This list was probably preceded by a verb such as ויל̇כוד, "and he [*scil.* Joshua] conquered," listing the various localities conquered by Joshua. Only in this way is the beginning of the preserved text of line 10 understandable: ל/בי]הודה את באר שבעה ואת בעלות, [in/for Ju]dah: Be'er Sheba [and] Beʿalot. In other words, in the area that subsequently became the territory of Judah, Joshua conquered Be'er Sheba and Beʿalot. This wording also makes it likely that a sequence such as]חקר וקטרון ואפרנים in line 13 implies that these localities were in close proximity, unless the scribe was inconsistent and forgot to precede each locality by את.

The names in this list were probably grouped in a certain way, each unit starting with את, for otherwise the interchange of את and ואת is not understandable. This explains for example the relation between the items in lines 4–6.

Although the details in the list are unclear and the text is fragmentary, a certain logic is visible. The list starts with the north: [Ma]don (cf. Josh 11:1; 12:19) as well as additional names of locations not mentioned in the Bible. It continues with the

[9] This list was published preliminarily, and with many mistakes, by Eisenman-Wise (see n. 7) and F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* (Leiden/New York: E. J. Brill, 1994) 227–9. My own readings were improved in a few cases by L. Mazor's identifications (see next note).

territory of Judah; the cities known from the Bible are: Be'er Sheba (Josh 15:28), Be'alot (Josh 15:25; cf. also Josh 15:9, 28 Ba'alah), Qe'ilah (Josh 15:44), 'Adullam (Josh 15:35), Temni (cf. Josh 15:10, 56 Timnah), Upper and Lower Gulot (Josh 15:19; Judg 1:15). Finally, the list contains cities from the tribe of Joseph: Gezer (Josh 16:3, 10) and Upper and Lower Beth-Ḥoron (Josh 16:3, 5).

The list includes several names not mentioned in the Bible, but known to be connected with the three areas just mentioned. All these data have been analyzed in detail in a valuable study by L. Mazor.[10]

(2) *Areas not conquered by Joshua*

A few fragments seem to list areas that had not been conquered by Joshua. This understanding is based on frg. 8, which lists the four tribes of Sim'[on], Dan, Issachar, and Asher and also contains a segment of a narrative in line 2: ודן לוא הכה גם הוא את, ("nor did Dan conquer …") for which cf. Judg 1:34–35. In the lacuna, this fragment may have mentioned Har-Ḥeres, which Dan did not conquer according to Judges 1. Line 3 of the same fragment, ו]וישכר את בית שן ואשר א[ת]ם ◦, should probably be understood as "[nor] did Issachar [conquer] Beth Shean, [nor] did Asher [conquer] …" There is no exact biblical parallel for this statement, but one is reminded of Judg 1:27, according to which Manasseh did not conquer Beth Shean. It is also possible that this fragment reflects Josh 17:11, according to which Manasseh possessed a few areas within the allotments of Issachar and Asher, namely Beth Shean and other localities: וישכר ובאשר בית שאן ובנותיה.

Frg. 3 2 mentions the Canaanite, signifying that it probably deals with cities that were not conquered by Joshua. The fragment also mentions "]from the valley of Akhor" (in Josh 15:7 that valley is mentioned as belonging to the tribe of Judah).

Frg. 11 probably deals with incomplete conquests (see line 1) and frg. 5 contains the phrase "these people," probably referring to those who were not destroyed by Joshua (for the phrase and idea, cf. Josh 23:3, 4, 12, 13).

b. The second type of support for the view that 4Q522 is related to Joshua derives from a few allusions to phrases in the book of Joshua (for the wording of lines 10–11 החטיונ֯י, and והשלוני, cf. the biblical text of 9:22 למה רמיתם אתנו). The text of line 11 has to be reconstructed as נ֯תתיו עבד עו֯לם לישר֯א֯ל on the basis of Josh 9:23 (thus Qimron).

β. *Interpretation of 4Q522 as 4QapocrJosh^{c}*

4Q522 9 i (and small fragments) lists names of places conquered by the Israelite tribes in the north of the country and in the territories of Judah and Joseph, and it further contains lists of areas that had not been conquered.

[10] L. Mazor, "The Description of the Land According to 4Q522," forthcoming.

It so happens that in the parallel to these lists in the biblical book of Joshua, at the end of the tribal list of Judah, the one city that the Judahites were unable to conquer, namely the city of Jebus, is mentioned specifically (15:63): "But the people of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem; so the Jebusites live with the people of Judah in Jerusalem to this day." A similar note is appended to the description of the tribe of Benjamin in Judg 1:21. It stands to reason that 4Q522 followed a similar procedure, moving from the lists of Judah and Joseph (note that the majority of the surviving names in col. i pertain to the tribal list of Judah) to the fate of Jerusalem and the subsequent building of the temple in that city.

The second column of this fragment starts off with Zion (line 2), probably continuing the description begun at the end of the previous column and in the first line of the present column. The logical link between the two columns could be the mentioning of the cities that were conquered and of Jerusalem, which was not conquered. The fact that this city had not been conquered is the link with the discussion regarding why the ark was not brought there. The situation depicted gives the impression that Joshua delivered his speech not far from Jerusalem, close to Bethel (cf. lines 12–13), after deciding not to bring the ark to Jerusalem.

The text of col. ii continues with Joshua's speech explaining why he was unable to conquer Jerusalem (line 2): first a negation (לוא) and afterwards the fragmentary text continues with להשכין שם את אהל מועד, "to install there the Tent of Meeting." At the time of Joshua, that city was still inhabited by the Jebusites, but he foresaw that in the future the city would be conquered by David, that the Tent of Meeting would be transferred there, and that eventually the temple would be established there. The reason for the need of an expulsion of the Amorites is probably the fear that they might disturb the building of the temple (just as the building of the Second Temple was disturbed by others).

The prophetic vision of what would happen in the future is clad in the form of a speech by an unnamed person, in the first person, and sometimes changing to the first person plural (line 12). This speaker can only have been Joshua himself.

Joshua also turns to someone in the second person singular (lines 10–11: "That I did not demand from you the decision of the Urim and Tummim" (אשר לוא דרשתי א֯ת מ֯שפט ה֯[אורים]/מאתכה). The wording of these lines should be seen in light of Josh 9:14 ואת פי יהוה לא שאלו with reference to the ruse of the Gibeonites.

Joshua gives three reasons for not bringing the tabernacle to Jerusalem, and by implication, for not building the temple there:

a. In the future, David will conquer Jerusalem and expel the Amorites from there. This statement implies that Joshua knew that in the future Jerusalem would become the central site of worship. He could only have known this if he was gifted with prophetic inspiration, since this is not stated explicitly in the Torah. The tradition that Joshua was a prophet is not universal, and among other

things was implied in Joshua's curse on the rebuilder of Jericho, which was to be implemented many generations later, in the time of Ahab, according to the story of 1 Kgs 16:34 (see chapter 26*). Joshua's exhortatory-prophetic character is also at the base of his final address in chapters 23–24 of the biblical book. In no case, however, is Joshua's mantic character as clear as in 4Q522 and in 4Q379 22 ii, which may therefore have belonged to the same composition. In the latter fragment, Joshua not only cursed the rebuilder of Jericho, but also foresaw that someone would actually rebuild the city.

Traditions that Joshua was gifted with prophetic power are also known from various *midrashim*.[11]

b. Although realizing that Jerusalem was chosen to be the future center for worship, Joshua was compelled not to bring the tabernacle to Jerusalem, since the place was still occupied by the local inhabitants.

c. The local inhabitants deceived Joshua, and by implication were not worthy of the honor of having the Tent of Meeting in their midst. This argument is not spelled out, but implied. More specifically, Joshua says that the Canaanites caused him to sin (line 10 החטיונ֗י,[12] "they have caused me to sin") and that they misled him (line 11 והשלוני, "they deceived me"); the reference must be to the Gibeonites' ruse that misled and deceived Joshua into allowing them to remain in the midst of the Israelites. For the formulation of lines 10–11, cf. the biblical text of 9:22 למה רמיתם אתנו. Joshua blames himself for not having turned to the device of the Urim and Tummim administered by the High Priest, who must be the person referred to in lines 10–11 (לוא דרשתי א֯[ת מ]שפט֯ ה֯[אורים] מאתכה).

The first person plural in line 12 may refer to either Joshua and the people or Joshua and Eleazar.

Acting on the basis of his prophetic vision of the future, Joshua decided not to install the Tent of Meeting in Jerusalem. This move is actually not surprising, since there was no reason to install the Tent of Meeting in Jerusalem in accordance with the requirements of the book of Deuteronomy, as that city had not yet been conquered and the name of God could therefore not be installed there. Only in retrospect did this failure to come to Jerusalem pose a problem, prompting Joshua's apologetic speech in 4Q522. It is not impossible that this aspect reveals the identity of the author of this composition as someone belonging to the priestly Jerusalem circles; they may have wished to explain why the Tent of Meeting was not brought to Jerusalem at an earlier stage.

Joshua decided to install the Tent of Meeting in a place unnamed in 4Q522. The exact location of the Tent of Meeting at the time of Joshua's speech is not clear from the remains of the manuscript, but it was probably in Bethel (cf. lines

[11] See L. Ginsberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1967) 7.266 and Sir 46:1.

[12] This form equals החטיאוני with a glide added (cf. Qimron, "Joshua Cycles," 506).

12–13). According to the different biblical traditions, the Tent of Meeting or the tabernacle (different terms are used) moved in different ways in Canaan. It transversed the Jordan with the Israelites according to Joshua chapter 3, and it was with the Israelites in Gilgal and Jericho (chapters 6–7). Afterwards the Israelites turned to Ai and Bethel, facing Jerusalem. According to the story, at that point Joshua faced the decision of whether to bring the ark to Jerusalem (not in accordance with the Torah, but in accord with what we know of the subsequent history of the Israelites) or to another place. Because of the aforementioned reasons, according to 4Q522, Joshua then decided to take the ark to another location, probably Shiloh.

This reasoning is based on the fact that line 13 mentions the moving of the Tent of Meeting from Beth[el] to an unnamed place. It seems to us that the name of Shiloh should be inserted in the lacuna at the end of line 12. Meanwhile, the fact that the ark was found at Bethel is reflected in the LXX in Judg 2:1 ff. where it is stated that the angel of the Lord came from Gilgal to Bochim and Bethel (MT Bochim). More explicitly, according to the tradition of Judg 20:26–28, Phineas son of Eleazar ministered before the ark at Bethel: "… Bethel [27]… for the ark of God's covenant was *there* in those days, [28]and Phineas son of Eleazar son of Aaron the Priest ministered before Him in those days …" It is not impossible that 4Q522 somehow reflects the various biblical traditions embedded in the books of Joshua and Judges regarding the ark, explaining how the ark arrived at Bethel and was later moved from there to Shiloh, where it was indeed found at a later stage according to Joshua 18.

There is a chronological problem in the combination of these traditions, since Eleazar was a contemporary of Joshua, while his son Phineas is mentioned in the tradition in Judges 20. It is not impossible that this Phineas was mentioned in the lacuna in 4Q522 9 ii 12–13, "[Phineas son of]Eleazar," but it is more logical to assume that the text mentioned Eleazar himself, since he was Joshua's associate in this action as well as on other occasions. Thus, when Moses was about to die he commissioned Joshua before Eleazar (Num 27:18–23), and Eleazar (always mentioned first) and Joshua distributed the regions of Canaan to the tribes of Israel (Num 32:28; 34:17; Josh 14:1; 17:4; 19:51; 21:1). Likewise, 1QDM I 11–12 mentions Eleazar together with Joshua.

One of the key words in col. ii is the root שכן. Joshua was unable to set up (להשכין) the Tent of Meeting in Jerusalem (line 2), so he decided to set it up far away from that city (line 12 ועתה נ[ש]כינה, "and now let us set up"). At the same time, Solomon will "dwell forever," ישכון לבטח (line 8).

γ. *4Q522 is closely linked with the composition contained in 4Q378–379*

In many ways, 4Q522 9 i–ii runs parallel to 4Q378–379, which have been named 4QapocrJosh[a,b] (olim: 4QpssJoshua[a,b]). The following arguments make it likely that they actually reflect the very same composition:

a. All three texts present a similar paraphrase of the book of Joshua, sometimes staying close to the biblical text, and sometimes diverging from it. The type of paraphrase is that of the book of Jubilees, the second half of the Temple Scroll, 4QparaGen-Exod (4Q422), and several other fragmentary compositions. In some sections, the rewritten text is close to that of the Bible; for example, 4Q379 12, narrating the crossing of the Jordan, is rather close to the biblical text of Josh 3:13–16. More frequently, however, the Qumran texts move away from the biblical text.

b. All three texts reflect a more hortatory and exhortatory version of Joshua than that of the biblical book, whose deuteronomistic layer already has an exhortatory character. Many of the sections of 4Q378–379 reflect speeches by Joshua, and likewise 4Q522 9 ii contains such a speech. These speeches are built on the model of those in Joshua chapters 1, 18–21, 23–24, and also on those of Moses in Deuteronomy 1–3, 28–31.

c. Joshua's prophetic character is evident in 4Q522 9 ii, in which he foretells the birth of David, knows that the ark will be brought to Jerusalem, and that the temple will be built there. This prophetic character is also visible in 4Q379 22 ii in which Joshua knows in advance that someone will actually rebuild Jericho. This feature is not prominent in the biblical book of Joshua, in which he merely utters a curse.

d. In all three texts, although not in all fragments, Joshua speaks in the first person. See 4Q522 9 ii 2, 10, 12 as well as 4Q379 10 3, 4; 17 5; 18 4, 5, 7; 22 i 4.

e. 4Q378 22 i 2–3 refers to Joshua as ישוע. The name of Joshua appears with this spelling also in 4Q522 9 ii 14 as well as in 1QDM I 12.

f. 4Q379 17 5 mentions Eleazar, who is also referred to in 4Q522 9 ii 13. Furthermore, the prayer in 4Q378 22 i 2–3 that mentions Joshua in the third person could be by Eleazar (thus Newsom); this fragment would be further support for connecting 4Q378 with 4Q522, since in the latter text Eleazar is probably spoken to in the second person (see above).

g. 4Q379 1, referring to the Levitical cities, mentions the tribes within which the Levites were to receive these allotments (cf. Joshua 21). These tribes are listed in the same way as in 4Q522 9 i and 5Q9, enumerated as את … ואת(ו).

h. The motif of guilt is prominent in these texts:

In 4Q522 9 ii 10–11 (with regard to the ruse of the Gibeonites), Joshua blames himself for not having turned to the device of the Urim and Tummim administered by the High Priest. See further above.

4Q378 6 i 4]א תפלה על חטאתינו "a prayer on behalf of our sins" and ibid., line 7 אן]שמכה הוי אחי עליכמה "your [g]uilt. Woe to you my brothers." This fragment may refer to the sins of the people with regard to Achan's violation of the *ḥerem* in Joshua 7, but may also refer to the sins of the people as a whole on several occasions when they rebelled in the wilderness. The "testing" mentioned twice in col. ii of the same fragment may refer to either occasion.

4Q378 22 i 1 ולא הכחדתם באשמתם "and you did not destroy them in their guilt." Although the editor of this fragment, C. Newsom, believes that the episode referred to is that of the Golden Calf, it is more likely that the text refers to the ruse of the Gibeonites "which you have not destroyed, in their sin." The text also refers to "Joshua the servant of your servant Moses," to the transferal of power from Moses to Joshua (line 3), and to the covenant between God and Abraham (line 4). The covenant referred to is probably that of Genesis 15, according to which God promised the land of the Canaanites to Abraham and his offspring, with the implication that the Canaanites should be killed; Joshua did not do this.

4Q378 24 3,]ת אשמן[, without any context.

i. 4Q379 26 2–3 mention Bethel without any context in line 2 and the verb רחקו in line 3, just as in 4Q522. Joshua suggests the moving of the Tent of Meeting "far away from …" (רחוק), while the next line mentions Beth[el]. The verb used in 4Q379 before the mentioning of Bethel is סבו, if the reading is correct (סֹבוּ בבית אל), a verb mentioned also elsewhere in the Bible with regard to the movements of the ark (1 Sam 5:8; Josh 24:33a LXX).

The relevance of the three fragments containing sections of Psalm 122 (see n. 4) to 4Q522 still needs to be established. Even if the handwriting of these fragments is identical to that of the main fragment on photograph PAM 43.606, they may have derived from a composition different from 4Q522, even though the connection with Jerusalem is obvious. Since 4Q522 contained both a list of geographical names and an explanation as to why Joshua's central place of worship was not Jerusalem, one wonders whether there is room in this composition for a psalm of praise for Jerusalem when Jerusalem has not yet been conquered.

At the same time, there is physical room for this short psalm in the reconstruction of 4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}), probably below the text of 4Q522 9 i. That fragment contained sixteen lines of text, and was probably followed by the continued list of geographical names as contained in frgs. 6–7 and the other fragments. If, together with these fragments, the column contained some twenty-two lines, there remained enough space to include Psalm 122 at the bottom of col. i (six lines in Puech's reconstruction). That would be a natural place for this psalm. The contextual link between the psalm and the context of 4Q522 was discussed above. The connection between the psalm and the situation of 4Q522 may be supported by the actual wording of the psalm. Since in verse 2 it reads: "Our feet stood inside your gates, O Jerusalem," 4Q522 could have argued that Joshua, when delivering his speech, was actually very close to Jerusalem, but decided not to conquer the city.

From a physical point of view, the link is possible since the psalm fragments share an important feature with the main text of 4Q522 (4QapocrJosh^{c}) 9 i–ii, namely that the text was not consistently suspended from the lines, as in the great majority of Qumran texts, but rather, in disregard of the ruled lines, appeared below, above, and through them.

III. 5Q9 (5QapocrJosh?), Previously Named "Ouvrage avec toponymes"

A list of geographical names similar to that in 4Q522 9 i is known from the seven fragments of 5Q9, published by Milik in *DJD* III, 179 as "Ouvrage avec toponymes." The writing is described as late by Milik. As in 4Q522 9 i, this list mentions the figure of Joshua (frg. 1) and a list of geographical names (frgs. 1–7) from the same areas as covered by 4Q522. As in 4Q522 9 i, the names are preceded with את and ואת.

With one possible exception, the names mentioned in these fragments do not overlap with those listed in 4Q522 8 i, but they do refer to localities in the north of the country and from the tribes of Judah and Joseph. The preserved names include:

Qidah (1 2)
Ṣidon (2 1)
Beth Tap[uaḥ? (3 2; tribe of Judah: Josh 15:53)
ʿAin Ṣidon (4 1)
Kochabah (5 1)
שרדי (5 2; cf. Josh 19:10, 12 שריד; tribe of Zebulun)
The waters of Dan (5 3; cf. "the waters of Merom" in Josh 11:5, 7)
קטנ[ת (6 1; cf. Josh 19:15 Κατανα̣θ LXX [MT קטת])
Ṣeredah (6 2), from the tribe of Efraim (cf. 1 Kgs 11:26).

As in 4Q522, 5Q9 combined the list of names with a narrative, of which the name Joshua (1 1) and the phrase ויבאו כול[(6 3) have been preserved.

One or possibly two details, however, are probably common to both lists:

4Q522 mentions (13) Qiṭr[on, possibly from the tribe of Zebulun, cf. Judg 1:30 (one of the places that was not conquered), for which cf. the detail mentioned in 5Q9: קטנ[ת (6 1). The name Qiṭron does not occur in the tribal list of Zebulun in Joshua 19, but קטת is mentioned there; hence the assumption that this is the same locality. The common identity of the two names is supported by an explanatory note on a place like Ḥeṣron, on which Josh 15:25 notes: "this is Ḥaṣor." On the other hand, Amir believes that the two names represent different localities.[13]

4Q522, line 7 [Ma]don may be read as Ṣi]don as in 5Q9 2 1.

In the first stage, a link was established between 4Q378, 4Q379, and 4Q522, named 4QapocrJosh[a,b,c], all of which are paraphrases of Joshua. In the second stage, this group of three texts is now expanded to four, to include 5Q9. The link with that text is made through the contents of the list of geographical names in 4Q522 8 i, the similar form of both lists, and their mentioning of Joshua.

[13] D. Amir, "Qitron," *EncBib* VII.111.

IV. MasParaJosh (= Mas apocrJosh?)

MasParaJosh (= Mas1l; also known as Mas 1039–1211) may well reflect a fifth copy of the composition described here as apocrJosh. This composition, published by Talmon,[14] consists of two fragments, comprising altogether parts of ten lines, together with top and bottom margins, and probably with lacking intervening text between the two fragments. The script differs from that of 4Q522, but like 4Q522 8, the Masada fragment has words written through the lines (see lines A 4–5), which is rather unusual among the fragments from the Judean Desert. Talmon dates the script of this text to the end of the first century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE.

While Yadin described this text as reflecting a Samuel apocryphon, Talmon connects it with the book of Joshua, basing himself on a series of resemblances between the Masada text and Joshua's final speech in chapters 23–24. Likewise, 4Q379 17 reflects Joshua's final speech (cf. line 4 with Joshua 24:4–5), and that topic, together with the combination of speech and hymnic elements/prayer, makes it at least possible, if not likely, that 4Q379 and the Masada texts reflect the same composition. Talmon (pp. 156–7) likewise recognized certain similarities between this text and 4Q378–379 (4QapocrJosh[a,b]), although according to him they do not reflect the same composition.

The text contains no identifiable name(s) connecting it with the book of Joshua, but the identification is made on the basis of the phrases used. The fragment reflects ideas from Joshua's last speeches, especially the idea that God helped his people in their struggle against the enemies:

Line 5 נ]לחם לעמו באויביהם ולוא[ן

Line 7 אשר] דבר עליהם בא להם ולוא[ן נפל] דבר ארץ[ה

However, while the speeches in the biblical book are mainly hortatory and admonitory, the Masada fragment has a different tone. That text combines the speech with words of praise, and probably also with a prayer or hymn. The words נ]ו[דול אדוני, reconstructed by us on the last line, and continuing with a text that has not been preserved, were probably preceded by a closed paragraph, and would be a suitable beginning for such a hymnic unit. If this assumption is correct, one is referred for comparison to 4Q379 22 i and ii 5–7 that contain a similar hymnic unit that precedes Joshua's curse on the rebuilder of Jericho.

The spelling of מואדה on line A 8 of this document is identical to the writing of that word in several Qumran documents, and may indicate a Qumran origin for the manuscript as a whole.

---

[14] S. Talmon, "A Joshua Apocryphon from Masada," in *Studies on Hebrew and Other Semitic Languages Presented to Professor Chaim Rabin on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. Goshen-Gottstein, S. Morag and S. Kogut; Heb.; Jerusalem: Akademon, 1990) 147–57; revised version: "Fragments of a Joshua Apocryphon – Masada 1039–211 (Final Photo 5254)," *JJS* 47 (1996) 128–39.

The use of the divine appellations אל (line A 6), שם = "name" (line A 4), and אדוני (line A 8) rather than the Tetragrammaton also speaks for a Qumran sectarian origin.

V. 4QpaleoParaJosh (= 4Qpaleo apocrJosh[d]?)

Little is known about the very fragmentary 4QpaleoParaJosh (4Q123, published in *DJD* IX), dating to the last half of the first century BCE, which contains merely a few words and phrases from Joshua 21 (especially forms of מגרש), while deviating from the known texts of that chapter (cf. 2 1 משה עבדן]וה ביד presenting a slightly different form of Josh 21:2). This work may reflect yet another copy of the apocryphon of Joshua, as its fragmentary remains of Joshua 21 run parallel to 4Q379 (4QapocrJosh[b]) 1 and a small fragment of 4Q522 9 i, even though there are no verbal overlaps.

If indeed 4QpaleoParaJosh contains segments of the rewritten book of Joshua, it is significant to note that this work was written, among other things, in paleo-Hebrew characters.

VI. Coverage of the "apocryphon of Joshua"

The various fragments of the Joshua cycle possibly represent segments of the same composition, named here "apocryphon of Joshua." Segments of most chapters of the book of Joshua are represented in the following fragments:[15]

a. The earliest part of Joshua's career is probably represented by the Israelites' mourning for Moses, represented in 4Q379 14.

b. An account of the transferal of leadership from Moses to Joshua (Joshua 1) is contained in 4Q379 3–4.

c. The crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 3) is covered by 4Q378 12 and probably additional fragments of that manuscript.

d. Several aspects of the movements of the ark in the first chapters of Joshua are described in 4Q522 8 ii and probably also in 4Q379 26.

e. The curse on the rebuilder of Jericho (Josh 6:26) together with a prophetic vision regarding his identity is expressed in 4Q379 22 ii, preceded by hymns in 4Q379 22 i.

f. The Achan incident (Joshua 7) is probably alluded to in 4Q378 6 i.

[15] The dimension of the rewriting of the biblical stories in 4Q522 is analyzed thoroughly by Dimant, "*Apocryphon*," 200–204.

g. The blessings mentioned in 4Q378 15–17 may reflect the ceremony on or opposite Mt. Gerizim (Josh 8:30–35), even though Newsom connects them with the crossing of the Jordan (chapter 3) and the assembly at Gilgal (chapters 4–5).

h. The ruse of the Gibeonites (Joshua 9) is reflected in 4Q522 9 ii and also in 4Q378 22 (see above).

i. Joshua's restraining of the sun in chapter 10 is reflected in 4Q378 26, cf. especially line 5.

j. A summary of Joshua's victories over the inhabitants of Canaan is reflected in 4Q379 3 (parallel to Joshua 13).

k. Segments of the tribal lists in Joshua 15–20 described as the conquests of Joshua, as well as of the lists of localities not conquered by Joshua, are contained in 4Q522 9 i as well as in smaller fragments of that composition. Similar lists are contained in 5Q9 (5QapocrJosh?) and in 4Q379 1. See also:

l. The Levitical cities in Joshua 21 are mentioned in 4Q379 1, in a small fragment ascribed to 4Q522 9 i, and in 4QpaleoParaJosh.

m. A summary of the conquests in accordance with God's plan, described in Josh 21:43–45 in God's words, are related in 4Q378 11, in Joshua's words. For line 2, cf. Josh 21:45 and for line 3, cf. Josh 21:44. The same episode is also reflected in Mas apocrJosh.

n. Joshua's final speech (chapters 23–24) may be reflected in 4Q378 19 ii and in 4Q379 17 (cf. line 4 with Josh 24:4–5). The same episode may be reflected also in Mas apocrJosh.

Beyond the aforementioned compositions devoted to Joshua, the figure of Joshua is mentioned only rarely in the Qumran texts: 1Q*Dibre Moshe* (1QDM) I 12; Damascus Document (CD) V 4.

VII. Qumran Authorship?

Because of the uncertainties concerning the relation between the six different manuscripts of the rewritten book of Joshua, the issue of their possible Qumran authorship has to be dealt with separately and may be answered affirmatively for some manuscripts, although the evidence is not clear.

Talmon considers 4Q378–379 and probably MasParaJosh to be Essene and accordingly he attempts to explain why the *yaḥad* would be interested in this biblical book.

Puech[16] considers 4Q522 to be an Essene document, and makes certain connections between the views of the Essenes and the content of that document.

[16] Puech, "Pierre de Sion," 691.

Likewise, Dimant claims that "several passages espouse ideas close to those expressed in works from the circle of the Qumran community."[17]

On the other hand, Eshel, in a brief study considers the Joshua apocryphon to be a non-Qumranic composition.[18]

There are a few signs of a possible sectarian authorship of some of the rewritten Joshua texts from Qumran and Masada:

a. An isolated phrase,]ולתת הון לן[, occurs without context in 4Q378 20 ii 5.

b. 4Q379 12 5 determines the date of the crossing of the Jordan according to the chronology of the jubilee years, which could suggest a sectarian origin (cf. 4QCommGen A col. I and the book of Jubilees).

c. That 4Q379 (4QapocrJosh[b]) was held in high esteem at Qumran is shown by the fact that it was quoted by 4QTest, which is definitely a sectarian composition.[19]

d. Among the texts analyzed here, only MasParaJosh, found at Masada, seems to reflect the custom known from several Qumran compositions of avoiding the Tetragrammaton and using other divine appellations instead. See § IV above. On the other hand, 4Q378, 4Q379, and 4Q522 freely use the divine appellations יהוה, אלהים, and אלוה.

The Qumran scribal practice is reflected in three of the Joshua documents. However, these features do not render the manuscripts as being Qumran texts; it only is made probable that the texts were copied by Qumran scribes.[20]

4Q522 is written *plene*, including such typical Qumran forms as ראישׁון in line 7, מאתכה in line 11, and עמכה in one of the fragments, but no additional forms typical of the Qumran scribal practice are found in these texts.

4Q378 contains a mixture of short second person singular forms, such as עמך, and long ones (such as עמכה), but the long ones are more frequent. It also contains forms of the קטלתה type. It contains a spelling מושה (3 ii and 4 5) as well as other features of the Qumran scribal practice.

The form מואדה on line 8 of MasParaJosh recurs in several Qumran documents, and may indicate a Qumran origin for the text as a whole.

---

[17] Dimant, "*Apocryphon*," 181.

[18] No precise arguments were given by Eshel (see n. 8).

[19] A portion of this document (frg. 22 7–15) is quoted as the last section of 4QTest. On the other hand, according to H. Eshel, 4QTest quoted from 4Q379. Among other things, Eshel claims that 4Q379 (4QapocrJosh[b]) quoted from 4QTest since the former includes no actualizing material similar to the curse. However, if the section is viewed as a prophecy, it is paralleled by the mantic character of 4Q522 9 ii, as noted below. See H. Eshel, "The Historical Background of 4QTest in the Light of Archaeological Discoveries," *Zion* 55 (1990) 141–50 (Heb.); idem, "The Historical Background of the Pesher Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho," *RevQ* 15 (1992) 413–9. Against this view, see T. H. Lim, "The 'Psalms of Joshua' (4Q379 frg. 22 col. 2): A Reconsideration of Its Text," *JJS* 44 (1993) 309–12, esp. 309, n. 8.

[20] See *Scribal Practices*, 261–73.

VIII. Date

Beyond the paleographical dates of the manuscripts, which are not a good indication of the period of authorship, the curse against the rebuilder of Jericho in 4Q379 22 ii is probably the only datable element in the composition. Several scholars have suggested that the object of that curse is Simon or John Hyrcanus, in which case the composition should be considered anti-Hasmonean. If this assumption is correct, the composition would have been written either in the late second or early first century BCE.[21]

The theological discussion in 4Q522 as to why Jerusalem was not made a religious center in the days of Joshua may have been written from the point of view of the Jerusalem priesthood, but this element is not datable.

[21] See Eshel, "Historical Background" (see n. 19).

Chapter Eight

The Textual Basis of Modern Translations of the Hebrew Bible

One is led to believe that two distinct types of modern translation of the Hebrew Bible exist: scholarly translations included in critical commentaries, and translations prepared for believing communities, Christian and Jewish. In practice, however, the two types of translation are now rather similar in outlook and their features need to be scrutinized.

Scholarly translations included in most critical commentaries are eclectic, that is, their point of departure is MT, but they also draw much on all other textual sources and include emendations when the known textual sources do not yield a satisfactory reading. In a way, these translations present critical editions of the Hebrew Bible, since they reflect the critical selection process of the available textual evidence. These translations claim to reflect the *Urtext* of the biblical books, even if this term is usually not used explicitly in the description of the translation. The only difference between these translations and a critical edition of the texts in the original languages is that they are worded in a modern language and usually lack a critical apparatus defending the text-critical choices.

The publication of these eclectic scholarly translations reflects a remarkable development. While there is virtually no existing reconstruction of the *Urtext* of the complete Bible in Hebrew (although the original text of several individual books and chapters has been reconstructed),[1] such reconstructions do exist in

[1] The following studies (arranged chronologically) present a partial or complete reconstruction of (parts of) biblical books: J. Meinhold, *Die Jesajaerzählungen Jesaja 36–39* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898); N. Peters, *Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur Erklärung der Bücher Samuel* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1899) 558–62 (1 Sam 16:1–19:18); C. H. Cornill, *Die metrischen Stücke des Buches Jeremia* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1901); F. Giesebrecht, *Jeremias Metrik am Texte dargestellt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905); D. H. Müller, *Komposition und Strophenbau* (Alte und Neue Beiträge, XIV Jahresbericht der Isr.-Theol. Lehranstalt in Wien; Vienna: Hölder, 1907); P. Haupt, "Critical Notes on Esther," *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of W. R. Harper* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1908) II.194–204; J. Begrich, *Der Psalm des Hiskia* (FRLANT 25; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926); C. C. Torrey, "The Archetype of Psalms 14 and 53," *JBL* 46 (1927) 186–92; K. Budde, "Psalm 14 und 53," *JBL* 47 (1928) 160–83; P. Ruben, *Recensio und Restitutio* (London: A. Probsthain, 1936); F. X. Wutz, *Systematische Wege von der Septuaginta zum hebräischen Urtext* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1937); W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* (ed. H. H. Rowley; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950) 1–18; F. M. Cross, Jr. and D. N. Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University,

translation. These translations, such as included in the volumes of the *International Critical Commentary* (*ICC*) and the *Biblischer Kommentar* (*BK*) delete, add, transpose or correct words or verses in MT on the basis of the LXX or a Qumran text, and present a reconstructed text which often differs greatly from MT. These reconstructions have not been suggested in the languages of the Bible, Hebrew and Aramaic, probably because scholars feel that they lack the criteria or tools for creating such reconstructions in the original languages. As a result, scholars are more daring in translated tools, even though in actual fact the two enterprises are equally daring. It is probably the distance between the original languages of the Bible and the familiar European language that facilitates an enterprise in translation that is not attempted in the original languages. In a way this is strange, since only a very small number of problems are avoided when the reconstruction is presented in translation; most of the difficulties concerning the reconstruction of the *Urtext* also have to be faced in European languages.

A second type of translation is intended for believing communities. We focus on the theoretical background of such translations.

From the outset, translations intended for faith communities are distinct from the translations included in critical commentaries. Scholarly translations cater to the academic community and as such are entitled to be vague or to omit difficult words in the middle of the text; they also permit themselves to be daring in their reconstruction of the original text. They allow themselves to use different typefaces or colors to indicate different layers of composition or transmission, etc. All these elements are foreign to translations produced for believing communities, as these are intended for use in a confessional environment or by the general public.

In recent decades, the two types of translation have become almost indistinguishable and often share the same principles. Translations meant for faith communities now often follow the principles of scholarly translations. There are two types of such modern translation and our attention here is directed to the second:

1. A small group of modern translations claim to faithfully represent one of the standard texts of the Bible. The majority represent MT, but some translate

---

1950; 2d ed.: Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975); iidem, "The Song of Miriam," *JNES* 14 (1955) 237–50; F. M. Cross, Jr., "A Royal Song of Thanksgiving II Samuel 22 = Psalm 18," *JBL* 72 (1953) 15–34; L. A. F. Le Mat, *Textual Criticism and Exegesis of Psalm XXXVI* (Studia Theol. Rheno-Traiectina 3; Utrecht: Kemink, 1957); M. Naor, "Exodus 1–15, A Reconstruction," in *Sefer S. Yeivin* (ed. S. Abramsky; Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1970) 242–82 (Heb.); P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 46–86; B. Mazar, "hgbwrym 'sr ldwyd," *'z ldwyd* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1964) 248–67 = *Canaan and Israel* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1974) 183–207; A. Gelston, "Isaiah 52:13–53:12: An Eclectic Text and a Supplementary Note on the Hebrew Manuscript Kennicott 96," *JSS* 35 (1990) 187–211; P. G. Borbone, *Il libro del profeta Osea, Edizione critica del testo ebraico* (Quaderni di Henoch 2; Torino: Silvio Zamorani, 1987 [1990]).

the Vulgate (in the case of several Catholic translations),[2] the Peshitta,[3] or the LXX.[4]

2. The majority of the modern translations represent the biblical witnesses eclectically. As with the translations included in critical commentaries, they are mainly based on MT, but when the translators felt that MT could not be maintained, they included readings from one of the ancient translations, mainly the LXX, and in recent years also from the Qumran scrolls. Translations intended for believing communities usually present fewer non-Masoretic readings than scholarly translations, but the principles are identical, and it is the principles that count. These translations also contain a few emendations (conjectures). The decisions behind the inclusion of non-Masoretic readings reflect a scholarly decision procedure in the areas of textual criticism and exegesis. However, the reader is only rarely told how and why such decisions were made.

Most translators receive little guidance in text-critical decisions.[5] Reliance on one of the critical editions of the Hebrew Bible is of little help, for the main edition used, *BHS*, mentions preferable readings in the apparatus rather than in the text, and in such an impractical and subjective way that they cannot guide the translator. *BHQ* is more practical for the user, and may create a unified, even ecumenical approach, but its unavoidable subjectivity is equally problematical as *BHS* (see chapter 18*). Besides, presently the preferred readings of *BHQ,* prepared under the aegis of the UBS, are not meant to be guide new translation projects sponsored by the UBS.

The case of the New Testament is distinctly different. The decision-making process was much easier for the translation of this corpus than for the Hebrew Bible, since in the last few centuries a tradition has developed to translate the New Testament from existing critical editions of the Greek text. Thus the *Revised*

---

[2] E. g., *The Old Testament, Newly Translated from the Latin Vulgate*, by Msgr. Ronald A. Knox (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1949; New York: Sheed and Ward, 1954).

[3] G. M. Lamsa, *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts Containing the Old and New Testaments Translated from the Peshitta, The Authorized Bible of the Church of the East* (Nashville: Holman Bible Publishers, 1933).

[4] Several confessional translations of the LXX are being prepared for the Eastern European churches for whom the LXX has a sacred status. For scholarly translations of the LXX, see those listed in S. P. Brock et al., *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973) and Dogniez, *Bibliography*.

[5] Some guidance is given by the series *Helps for Translators*, such as in D. J. Clark and N. Mundhenk, *A Translator's Handbook on the Books of Obadiah and Micah* (London/New York/Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1982); D. J. Clark and H. A. Hatton, *A Translator's Handbook on the Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989). See http://www.logos.com/products on this series of 21 volumes. Some volumes focus more on the options provided by the different English translations, and only rarely resort to the ancient versions. Other volumes resort much to the ancient texts, e. g. R. L. Omanson and Ph. A. Noss, *A Handbook on the Book of Esther – The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1997).

Version (1881–1885) was based on the edition of Westcott and Hort,[6] Moffatt's translation[7] used the edition of H. von Soden, and the RSV[8] was based on the 17th edition of Nestle's critical reconstruction of the text. Moreover, a special edition was prepared by Aland and others to meet the needs of the translators.[9] This volume provides: (1) a critical apparatus restricted for the most part to variant readings significant for translators or necessary for the establishing of the text; (2) an indication of the relative degree of certainty for each reading adopted in the text; and (3) a full citation of representative evidence for each reading selected.[10]

In the area of the Hebrew Bible, however, there is little guidance for textual decisions. The rich and learned volumes of the UBS provide some guidance,[11] but they are of only limited practical help for translators (they are more valuable for textual critics). Indeed, Scanlin reports of the difficulties experienced by translators in using the vast amount of information contained in these volumes.[12] These volumes cover only a very limited number of textual variations, viz., details in which modern translations differ from MT. But translators need guidance regarding *all* the differences among the ancient textual witnesses, necessitating a much wider coverage in the handbooks.

We now turn to the theoretical aspects of the textual background of modern translations of the Hebrew Bible meant for faith communities. The studies written in this area pointed out the numerous differences among the various translations. Rüger, Albrektson, Scanlin, McKane, Locher, and many others described these differences as deriving from the different text-critical background of the translations.[13] Among other things, Scanlin noted how certain modern transla-

---

[6] B. T. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1881; London/New York: Macmillan, 1898).

[7] J. Moffatt, *The Bible, A New Translation* (New York/London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1922, 1924–1925).

[8] *The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version* (London: Collins, 1952).

[9] K. Aland et al., *The Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1966).

[10] This edition is accompanied by B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (3d ed.; London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1975), intended to further assist the translators.

[11] HOTTP and Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*.

[12] H. P. Scanlin, "The Presuppositions of HOTTP and the Translator," *BT* 43 (1992) 101–16.

[13] H. P. Rüger, "Was übersetzen Wir? – Fragen zur Textbasis, die sich aus der Traditions- und Kanonsgechichte ergeben," in *Die Übersetzung der Bibel – Aufgabe der Theologie, Stuttgarter Symposion 1984* (ed. J. Gnilka– and H. P. Rüger; Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag, 1985) 57–64; B. Albrektson, "Vom Übersetzen des Alten Testaments," in *Glaube und Gerechtigkeit. Rafael Gyllenberg in Memoriam* (Helsinki Vammala: Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran, 1983) 5–18; Scanlin, "HOTTP" (see n. 12 above); W. McKane, "Textual and Philological Notes on the Book of Proverbs with Special Reference to the New English Bible," *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society 1971–1972*, 24 (1974) 76–90; C. Locher, "Der Psalter der 'Einheitsübersetzung' und die Textkritik, I," *Bib* 58 (1977) 313–41; ibid., II, 59 (1978) 49–79. For brief discussions of the problems involved, see: G. C. Aalders, "Some Aspects of Bible Translation Concerning the

tions frequently deviated from MT, especially in 1 Samuel, where MT is often corrupt. Other scholars simply listed the differences among the textual witnesses that could result in different modern translations, and not knowing which translation to prefer, they raised their hands in despair.[14]

There is, however, one principle that almost all translators have in common, the theoretical background of which has, to the best of my knowledge, not been established. It is more or less axiomatic in modern translation enterprises that the translation be eclectic; that is, that MT should be followed in principle, but occasionally abandoned. At the same time, the modern translations show that there is no agreement in matters of detail, as it is impossible to define when MT should be abandoned, and which variants or emendations should be adopted in the translation.

The textual eclecticism and subjectivity in the translation of the Hebrew Bible is ubiquitous.[15] The principles behind this approach have been described by several scholars and translators who expressed a view on the theoretical aspects of the translation procedure. Among them, Nida is one of the most prominent representatives:[16]

… in the case of the OT most translators no longer follow the Masoretic Text (the standard Hebrew text) blindly, for the Qumran evidence has clearly shown the diversity of traditions lying behind the LXX. It is important to note that translators are increasingly willing

---

Old Testament," *BT* 4 (1953) 97–102; idem, "Translator or Textual Critic?" *BT* 7 (1956) 15–16; W. A. Irwin, "Textual Criticism and Old Testament Translation," *BT* 5 (1954) 54–8; R. Sollamo, "The Source Text for the [Finnish] Translation of the Old Testament," *BT* 37 (1986) 319–22. The most thorough study in this area is S. Daley, *The Textual Basis of English Translations of the Hebrew Bible*, unpubl. Pd.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2007.

[14] See, for example, A. Schenker, "Was übersetzen Wir? – Fragen zur Textbasis, die sich aus der Textkritik ergeben," in *Übersetzung der Bibel* (see n. 13), 65–80. Schenker discusses in detail the pericope of the freeing of the slaves in Jeremiah 34 in the MT and LXX and analyzes the theological differences between the two texts. E. Ulrich, "Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to be Translated," in idem, *DSS*, 34–50 presents the reader with evidence of the availability in ancient times of various parallel forms of the Hebrew Bible, which the author names here "double literary editions." The following examples are presented of such double editions: the two versions of the story of David and Goliath, juxtaposed in MT, the two different versions of 1 Samuel 1–2 now presented in the MT and LXX, the MT version of Exodus and that of the SP and 4QpaleoExod^{m}, and the short and long editions of Jeremiah. On pp. 111–16, Ulrich presents "Reflections on determining which form of the biblical text to translate" on the basis of this textual evidence. The author claims that the parallel versions were produced in Hebrew by the Jewish community prior to the emergence of Christianity, and in the wake of this "Bible translators are faced with a question: how do we go about selecting the form of the text that should be translated?"

[15] To mention just a few translations: JB = *The Jerusalem Bible* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970); RSV; NRSV; NAB; NEB; REB; *La Sainte Bible, traduite en français sous la direction de l'Ecole biblique de Jérusalem* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1956); *Die Heilige Schrift, Altes und Neues Testament* (Bonn, 1966); *Einheitsübersetzung der Heiligen Schrift* (Stuttgart: Katholische Bibelanstalt, 1974).

[16] E. A. Nida, "Theories of Translation," *ABD* 6 (New York: Abingdon, 1992) 514.

to indicate the diversities of textual evidence. In some circles this change has seemed to represent an intellectual revolution.

In the preface to the New International Version (NIV), the principles are phrased as follows:[17]

For the Old Testament the standard Hebrew text, the Masoretic Text as published in the latest editions of *Biblia Hebraica*, was used throughout … The translators also consulted the most important early versions – the Septuagint; Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion … Readings from these versions were occasionally followed where the Masoretic Text seemed doubtful and where accepted principles of textual criticism showed that one or more of these textual witnesses appeared to provide the correct readings. Such instances are footnoted.

In the *Introduction to the Old Testament* of the REB, the translation enterprise is described as follows (pp. xv–xvii):

Despite the care used in the copying of the Massoretic Text, it contains errors, in the correction of which there are witnesses to be heard … Hebrew texts which are outside the Massoretic tradition: the Samaritan text and the Dead Sea Scrolls … the ancient versions … archaeological discoveries … the study of the cognate Semitic languages.

Albrektson makes similar remarks on the preparation of the Swedish translation:[18]

… Masoretic text. This is, on the whole, a good text … this text is in many places corrupt; it can and must be corrected. This may be done by means of other Hebrew texts, especially the Dead Sea scrolls … Corrections may also be made with the aid of the ancient translations … and sometimes it may even be necessary to resort to conjectural emendation of the text. According to the principles of the new translation, we should use all the resources of modern textual criticism, and this … is the first time that this has been done in a Swedish version of the Old Testament.

The same scholar also compared the approaches used by the different translations:[19]

… if one tries to summarize the principles stated in these different translations, it is rather difficult to discover any important differences or clear contrasts between them. If one tries to listen to the manner in which these common principles are stated, there is a definite difference in accent and emphasis. And if one examines how these principles have been put into practice, the difference becomes greater still … even if there is substantial agreement as to the principles to be followed in the choice of the textual basis of the translation, the practice may vary a great deal.

---

[17] *The Holy Bible, New International Version; Containing the Old Testament and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978).

[18] B. Albrektson, "The Swedish Old Testament Translation Project: Principles and Problems," in *Theory and Practice of Translation, Nobel Symposium 39, Stockholm 1976* (ed. L. Grähs et al.; Bern: P. Lang, 1978) 151–64. The quote is from p. 152.

[19] B. Albrektson, "Textual Criticism and the Textual Basis of a Translation of the Old Testament," *BT* 26 (1975) 314–24. The quote is from p. 318.

Common to most scholars and translators, thus, is the feeling that MT should be the base text for any translation, but that often other readings should be preferred (or in the words of Albrektson, that MT should be corrected). A preference for the Qumran texts is voiced by several scholars and translators, although probably only the NAB has used the evidence of the scrolls extensively. Albrektson[20] and Payne,[21] among others, noticed much use of the LXX in the NAB and JB by on the basis of the description in the preface and of the notes appended to the NAB. Greenspoon systematically studied the use of the LXX in the various translations.[22] Gordon reviewed the inclusion in some modern translations of elements from the Targumim.[23] When non-Masoretic elements are adopted by a translation, that translation takes the form of a true critical edition, because in such instances the MT readings, sometimes mentioned in an apparatus of notes, have been replaced by other readings. Thus, the NEB and REB notes contain such remarks as "Heb. adds," "verses … are probably misplaced," "so some MSS," "Heb. omits," "probable reading," etc. In the NAB and NEB, the non-Masoretic readings that have been accepted in the translation have been recorded in valuable monographs,[24] which are a good source for learning about the text-critical approach of these translations. Among other things, the notes in the NEB show that this translation often accepted details from the ancient versions that were probably never found in their Hebrew *Vorlage*, but were exponents of their translation technique in such grammatical categories as number, person, pronouns, and prepositions.[25]

If the faith communities pay so much tribute to modern critical scholarship, this approach should be appreciated, in spite of the subjectivity and eclecticism involved. Thus, modern translations produced for faith communities do not differ much from scholarly translations included in commentary series. Exactly the same principles are invoked, and often the same scholars are involved. Modern translations for faith communities have necessarily often become reconstructions

[20] Albrektson, "Textual Criticism," 317.

[21] D. F. Payne, "Old Testament Textual Criticism – Its Principles and Practice Apropos of Recent English Versions," *TynBul* 25 (1974) 99–112.

[22] L. Greenspoon, "It's All Greek to Me: The Septuagint in Modern English Versions of the Bible," in Cox, *VII Congress*, 1–21.

[23] R. P. Gordon, "The Citation of the Targums in Recent English Bible Translations (RSV, JB, NEB)," *JJS* 26 (1975) 50–60.

[24] Brockington, *Hebrew Text*; *Textual Notes on the New American Bible* (St. Anthony's Guild; Patterson, N. J. [n.d.]).

[25]
Gen 48:20	MT	בך
read		"בכם with Sept." (ἐν ὑμῖν)
Isa 20:2	MT	ביד
read		"אל with Sept." (πρός)
Isa 25:2	MT	מעיר
read		"ערים with Sept." (πόλεις)
Isa 32:1	MT	ולשרים
read		"ושרים with Sept." (καὶ ἄρχοντες)

of an *Urtext*. The main difference between these translations and their scholarly counterparts is probably that the latter are more daring, but this is merely a matter of quantity, not of principle. The principles involved in the text-critical decisions behind the modern translations were spelled out well by HOTTP, in a way that would be acceptable to most scholars.

In spite of the obvious advantages of a critical procedure in the creation of translations, this approach is problematical:

1. The main problem is the eclecticism itself, which some people regard as arrogance and which involves the subjective selection of readings found in the ancient translations and the Qumran manuscripts. Not everyone may be aware of the subjective nature of reconstructing Hebrew readings from the translations, and even more so, of the evaluation of textual readings. What is meant by evaluation is the comparison of readings, of MT and the other sources, with the intention of determining the single most appropriate reading in the context, or the original reading, or the reading from which all others developed.[26]

This subjectivity is so pervasive that well-based solutions seem to be impossible. In spite of the remarks in the introduction to HOTTP, there are probably no established rules of internal evaluation (on the basis of the biblical context), and most external evidence (relating to the nature and age of the translations and manuscripts) is irrelevant. The rules of evaluation to be used, mainly that of the *lectio difficilior*, have the appearance of objectivity, but they are often impractical and their employment is subjective. In the textual criticism of the New Testament the situation is easier, it seems, since in that area arguments based on external evidence are valid, and hence established critical editions of the New Testament have included variant readings in the critical text itself. The situation is probably also easier in New Testament textual criticism as the textual evidence is more extensive and a shorter interval separated the time of the autographs from our earliest textual evidence. The range of textual variation is probably also much narrower in the case of the New Testament than in that of the Hebrew Bible.

Subjectivity in textual evaluation seems to be in order since the whole translation enterprise is subjective. When we determine the meanings of words and

[26] A lengthy discussion was devoted to this aspect in *TCHB*, chapter 6, summarized as follows (pp. 309–10):

> The upshot of this analysis, then, is that to some extent textual evaluation cannot be bound by any fixed rules. It is an art in the full sense of the word, a faculty which can be developed, guided by intuition based on wide experience. It is the art of defining the problems and finding arguments for and against the originality of readings … Needless to say, one will often suggest solutions which differ completely from the one suggested on the previous day … Therefore, it is the choice of the contextually most appropriate reading that is the main task of the textual critic … This procedure is as subjective as subjective can be. Common sense is the main guide, although abstract rules are often also helpful. In modern times, scholars are often reluctant to admit the subjective nature of textual evaluation, so that an attempt is often made, conscious or unconscious, to create a level of artificial objectivity by the frequent application of abstract rules.

the relation between words and sentences do we not also invoke subjective judgments? But the latter kind of subjectivity is acceptable, since it is a necessary part of the translation procedure. At the same time, subjectivity regarding textual decisions is not a necessary part of the translation procedure, since one may always turn to an alternative approach, viz., to use a single source as the basis for a translation.

As a result of this subjective approach towards translating, each community will have a different textual base, and hence a different Bible. Some of these Bibles will be very different from the known ones.[27] These discrepancies usually pertain to small details, but some large details are also involved. Thus against all other translations, the NRSV includes a complete section from 4QSam^{a} at the end of 1 Samuel 10 explaining the background of the siege of Jabesh Gilead by Nahash the Ammonite. By the same token, there is no reason why one of the other modern translations should not represent the shorter text of the LXX of Jeremiah and of the Qumran manuscripts 4QJer^{b,d}, which present a somewhat different picture of the book from MT. There is also no reason why the translation of certain biblical episodes should not be expanded or shortened in accord with the text of the LXX or a Qumran scroll. For example, the story of David and Goliath is much shorter and probably more original in the LXX than in MT. And why not base the translation of the chronology of Kings on that of the LXX? Several scholars believe that the LXX or the so-called A Text of Esther is more authentic than MT, and by a similar reasoning one of these texts could be included in a modern translation of Esther. In the present generation, translators, and the textual critics behind them, have not yet dared to take these steps, but such decisions may be made in the future since many scholars believe that in these matters the LXX reflects an earlier text.

At this point, it is in order to dwell on the legitimacy of eclecticism in the case of the translations of the Hebrew Bible. While in scholarly translations eclecticism is an accepted practice, in confessional translations this approach is problematical because of the added public responsibility of such translations. Although the eclecticism of modern Bible translations has often been discussed,[28]

---

[27] Over the centuries, Christian communities became accustomed to using different translations, and therefore they continue to be open to the reality of such differences. Since the public is used to the availability of translations in different languages and different styles within a single language, differences based on textual data are just another level of discrepancy. The fact that the biblical text differs in these translations probably disturbs the reader less than it should do from a scholarly point of view.

[28] See J. Barr, "After Five Years: A Retrospect on Two Major Translations of the Bible," *HeyJ* 15 (1974) 381–405; B. Ljungberg– et al., *Att översätta Gamla testamentet – Texter, kommentarer, riktlinjer* (Statens offentliga utredningar 1974:33; Stockholm: Betänkande av 1971 ars bibelkommitté för Gamla testamentet, 1974); Payne, "Old Testament Textual Criticism," 99–112; B. Albrektson, "Textual Criticism"; idem, "The Swedish Old Testament Translation Project"; K. R. Crim, "Versions, English," *IDBSup*, 933–8; A. Schenker, "Was übersetzen Wir?";

its legitimacy has rarely been analyzed, as far as I know, with reference to translation enterprises within a Church context.

Within the Church, this eclecticism was imported from scholarship, long ago for the Protestant churches, and in 1943 also for Catholicism: The papal encyclical "*Divino Afflante Spiritu*: Encyclical of Pope Pius XII on Promoting Biblical Studies, Commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of *Providentissimus Deus*, September 30, 1943" does allow for the correction of errors, while it is vague on eclecticism. Since this encyclical is central also to some of the following remarks, the relevant passages are quoted verbatim.[29]

2. Beyond the text-critical discussions of details, scholars and translators have struggled, since the publication of HOTTP, with the question of which text form should be translated. HOTTP presents a lucid discussion of this issue, referring to various "stages" in the development of the Hebrew text, and it concludes that

---

H. P. Rüger, "Was übersetzen Wir?"; and the discussions cited in these studies and in notes 14 ff. above.

[29] *17*. The great importance which should be attached to this kind of criticism [i. e., textual criticism] was aptly pointed out by Augustine, when among the precepts he recommended to the student of the Sacred Books, he put in the first place the care to possess a corrected text. "The correction of the codices" – so says the most distinguished Doctor of the Church – "should first of all engage the attention of those who wish to know the Divine Scripture so that the uncorrected may give place to the corrected." [*De doctr. christ.* ii, 21; *PL* 34, col. 40.] In the present day indeed this art, which is called textual criticism and which is used with great and praiseworthy results in the editions of profane writings, is also quite rightly employed in the case of the Sacred Books, because of that very reverence which is due to the Divine Oracles. For its very purpose is to insure that *the sacred text be restored, as perfectly as possible, be purified from corruptions due to the carelessness of the copyists and be freed, as far as may be done, from glosses and omissions, from the interchange and repetition of words and from all other kinds of mistakes* (my italics, E. T.), which are wont to make their way into writings handed down through many centuries.

18. It is scarcely necessary to observe that this criticism, which some fifty years ago not a few made use of quite arbitrarily and often in such wise that one would say they did so to introduce into the sacred text their own preconceived ideas, today has rules so firmly established and secure, that it has become a most valuable aid to the purer and more accurate editing of the sacred text and that any abuse can easily be discovered. Nor is it necessary here to call to mind – since it is doubtless familiar and evident to all students of Sacred Scripture – to what extent namely the Church has held in honor these studies in textual criticism from the earliest centuries down even to the present day.

19. Today, therefore, since this branch of science has attained to such high perfection, it is the honorable, though not always easy, task of students of the Bible to procure by every means that as soon as possible may be duly published by Catholics editions of the Sacred Books and of ancient versions, brought out in accordance with these standards, which, that is to say, unite the greatest reverence for the sacred text with an exact observance of all the rules of criticism. And let all know that this prolonged labor is not only necessary for the right understanding of the divinely-given writings, but also is urgently demanded by that piety by which it behooves us to be grateful to the God of all providence, Who from the throne of His majesty has sent these books as so many paternal letters to His own children. Quoted from *The Papal Encyclicals 1939–1958* (ed. C. Carlen IHM; n.p.: McGrath, 1981) 65–79 (here 69–70, on "The Importance of Textual Criticism"). This encyclical was brought to my attention by J. Scott, who also referred me to J. A. Fitzmyer's discussion of its content: *The Biblical Commission's Document from 1993: "The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church"* (*SubBi* 18; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1995).

translations ought to be based not on the absolute *Urtext* of the Bible (stage 1), but on the reconstructed base of all known textual evidence (stage 2).[30] The implication of these views is that when departing from MT, Bible translations should have leaned towards the LXX prior to 1947, being the best available non-Masoretic text, and since that time towards both the LXX and the Qumran scrolls.[31] Subsequent translations will differ yet again if a new manuscript find is made in the Judean Desert or elsewhere.

However, it seems that a Bible translation enterprise should not be involved in everlasting scholarly discussions of the theoretical basis of the translation such as we have seen in recent years. There simply are no answers to the theoretical questions regarding the original text(s) posed by HOTTP and others. Furthermore, it is questionable whether religious communities should look up to scholarship for answers if, according to most scholars, there are no answers. Every generation of scholars will have different views concerning which text or texts should be translated and which stage in the development of the Hebrew Bible should be aimed at.

3. Most modern translations have been prepared for use within the Church, rendering it appropriate to dwell on the approach towards the Bible within faith communities. Christianity accepts various forms of Holy Scripture, in the original languages and in translation. When presenting the *Hebrew* form of the Bible, Christianity has traditionally accepted MT, certainly since the Reformation. Moreover, several Protestant theologians of the seventeenth century accepted the sanctity of the vowel points, which by implication involved acceptance of the precise form of the consonants of MT. Accordingly, the translations of Tyndale,

---

[30] This policy was criticized by Scanlin, "HOTTP," 104–5 (see n. 12 above): "What text do we translate? Is the primary focus of interest the *Urtext* or a later canonical form of the text? B. Albrektson, one of the first outspoken critics of the policy of HOTTP regarding emendation, ascribes little normative value to a stage 2, the earliest attested text, or 3, the proto-Masoretic text."

[31] Many of the translators' preferences based on the ancient translations are questionable. Thus, most of the readings referring to small details in grammatical categories accepted by the NEB and recorded by Brockington, *Hebrew Text* (see n. 24 above), refer to grammatical deviations of the translators and not to scribal corruptions. A more substantial example is found in 1 Sam 1:23 where MT reads "May the Lord bring His word to fulfillment," and where the reading of the LXX and 4QSam^{a} ("May the Lord bring your resolve to fulfillment") has been adopted by the NAB and NRSV. This preference pertains to a reading that seems to be equally as good as that of MT, and accordingly both readings could have been original. In v 9 MT "Hannah stood up after she had eaten and drunk at Shilo," the NAB omitted "and drunk" with codex B of the LXX ("after one such meal at Shiloh") and added "and presented herself before the Lord" with the same translation. Again, this is a choice based on literary judgment. Two verses later, in Hannah's prayer, Hannah promises that "I will give him to the Lord for as long as he lives," followed in the translation by "neither wine nor liquor shall he drink …" with the LXX. These and numerous other deviations from MT in the NAB are based on literary judgments of variant readings. These judgments are not incorrect, but they are based on subjective literary judgments beyond the argument of textual corruption.

Coverdale, and the Geneva Bible were based on MT; so was the translation by Luther, and the King James Version (KJV), based on the Rabbinic Bible. At the time of these translations, the Vulgate and LXX were revered by the Catholic Church,[32] but for the purpose of translation these two versions, rightly, were not mixed with MT.

In modern times, however, the approach of translators has changed with the development of the critical approach, a better understanding of the LXX and the other versions, better insights into the issue of the original text(s) of the Bible, and now also with the discovery of the Qumran texts.[33] While, in the past, MT formed the basis for translations in accord with the approach of Protestant scholarship, modern Bible translations follow the views developed in the scholarly world. These views are considered more advanced, probably on the basis of an intuitive understanding that the reconstruction of an *Urtext* brings the readers closer to the original form(s) of Scripture. This modern approach of eclecticism and of determining the stage to be translated is not based on any intrinsic religious dogmas, but simply looks to the achievements of scholarship in the hope scholars can reconstruct the original form of the Hebrew Bible. What is problematical with this approach is the notion that scholars can provide such answers. In fact, experience has taught us that with the increase in analysis of textual witnesses, expressing a view on the original text becomes more difficult.[34]

4. Christian theology could turn to the sound argument that Christianity is not bound by MT. This point was very strongly made by M. Müller who argued that the final form of MT was fixed after the beginning of Christianity and should therefore not be used in a Church environment.[35] According to this view, the Greek Old Testament text used in the New Testament, close to that of the uncials of the LXX (although in fact this Greek form was often closer to MT than those uncials), remains the determining form of Scripture.[36] The first-century Old Testament basis of the New Testament in Greek should therefore be used for our

[32] In modern times, however, the degree of authenticity of the Vulgate was toned down in paragraphs 20–21 of the mentioned encyclical (see n. 29 above).

[33] These developments were summarized as follows by H. G. Grether, "Versions, Modern Era," *ABD* (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 6.848: "When the OT has been translated from Hebrew (and Aramaic), the text used in the modern period has nearly always been the Masoretic Text (MT), but with a significant development that resulted, in many cases, in modifications of the MT as the text base used for translation. There became available critical printed editions of the text, with alternative manuscript and versional readings in the margin. These alternative readings were sometimes adopted for translation … *Biblia Hebraica* … Many of these variants have been used by Bible translators since they appeared."

[34] In my own thinking, I shifted to a position of what may be called a sequence of original texts rather than a single original text. See my study "Place of Masoretic Text."

[35] M. Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint* (JSOTSup 206; Copenhagen International Seminar 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

[36] See R. Hanhart, "Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta-Forschung für die Theologie," *Theologische Existenz Heute* 140 (1967) 38–64; idem, "Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta in neutestamentlicher Zeit," *ZTK* 81 (1984) 395–416.

current Bible translations.[37] However, this attempt will prove to be unproductive, because that Greek text is no longer obtainable and because more than one text was current at the time.[38]

Having reviewed the difficulties involved in choosing the textual basis for modern Bible translations, we note again that the main problem is the scholarly principle of eclecticism, which was applied only relatively recently in Bible translations and which has no doctrinal background in ancient Christianity.[39] It is suggested here that a return be made to the period before eclecticism was practiced in the creation of Bible translations. If MT is chosen as the basis for a translation, it should be followed consistently. Likewise, if the Vulgate or LXX be chosen, those sources, too, should be followed consistently. The choice of such a non-eclectic procedure should probably be considered to reflect a cautious and conservative approach. It is not impossible that at this stage the editors of HOTTP will agree with this approach for the simple reason that, rather paradoxically, after all the efforts invested in the text-critical comparison, usually MT is preferred.[40]

We therefore suggest returning to the principles of the first biblical translations that were based on MT, such as the KJV. In modern times, such translations can be improved greatly. We can actually look to a modern model such as the NJPST, which consistently follows MT. It should not go unnoticed, however, that it is precisely this non-eclecticism in NJPST (and of its predecessor, NJV) that has drawn much criticism.[41] Obviously there are many problems in producing a modern translation that follows MT only, and at times unconventional solutions would have to be found to enable the inclusion in the text of details that are unintelligible or even corrupt.[42] It is precisely these aspects that have induced

---

[37] It is unclear whether Müller is suggesting that the practical implications of his own views be followed, namely that future translations of the Old Testament be based on the LXX rather than MT. Note Müller's formulations on pp. 7, 143–4.

[38] Naturally, this claim would be in direct disagreement with the views held by Jerome, who advocated the use of the Hebrew Bible (to which Müller reacted: "Jerome's reversion to *Hebraica Veritas* rests on an untenable premise" [ibid., p. 143]).

[39] The case of the New Testament eclectic translations is different since the editions of the New Testament are eclectic. When an accepted New Testament text was created by Erasmus in 1516–1519, it was eclectic, and accordingly the whole tradition of the New Testament text and translations has remained eclectic. On the whole, it seems that the principle of eclecticism has been imported from the world of the New Testament to that of the Hebrew Bible.

[40] On the other hand, this conservative approach of HOTTP is criticized by Barr in his review of Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle* in *JTS* 37 (1986) 445–50.

[41] E.g., J.A. Sanders, "Text Criticism and the NJV Torah," *JAAR* 39 (1971) 193–7, esp. 195–6.

[42] Producing a translation that follows only MT is problematic on a practical level. The implications of this adherence to the "traditional Hebrew text" in the various Jewish American Bible versions were discussed in detail by H.P. Scanlin, "… According to the Traditional Hebrew Text as a Translation Principle in *Tanakh*," in *I Must Speak to You Plainly: Essays in Honor of Robert G. Bratcher* (ed. R.L. Omanson; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000) 23–37. In NJPST's adherence

modern translators to opt for eclecticism.[43] But we have seen that the dangers of this eclecticism seem to be greater than presenting a diplomatic translation of MT. The modern public is probably sophisticated enough to accept occasional notes in the translation such as "meaning of Hebrew uncertain" and this inelegant solution is preferable to the subjective eclecticism imported from the world of scholarship.

Our scholarly experience tells us to believe in complicated textual developments, textual variety, different stages of an original text, etc. We even suggest the production of scholarly editions in which all these texts are juxtaposed.[44] However, the more the ancient sources are unraveled and analyzed, the more we realize the limitations of our speculations about the nature of the biblical text.[45] Because of all these uncertainties, it seems that the public deserves a diplomatic translation of a single text, be it MT, the LXX, or the Vulgate.

Eclecticism, the major feature characterizing all modern translations, has entered the world of confessional translations through the back door, coming from the academic world. This approach created subjective translations that are often indefensible; it has also involved the Church in scholarly discussions regarding the original form of the biblical text, discussions in which scholars themselves have no answers. In due course, reasoning along these lines could give rise to translations that are completely different from MT. It is therefore suggested that a systematic and consistent translation be made of either the MT, Vulgate, LXX,

---

to MT, some unusual techniques were used to overcome this problem, such as the use of ellipsis yielding an artificial text, which appears to resemble MT, but is in fact far removed from it (e. g. Gen 4:8). Furthermore, in his description of the first *JPS* translation, H. L. Ginsberg described the policy of the Torah committee as:

> … where we have been convinced that the text is corrupt, we have made do with the received text if it was at all possible to squeeze out of it a meaning not too far removed from what we thought might have been the sense of the original reading; and in some of the more hopeless cases – and there are quite a few of them – we have added a note to the effect that the Hebrew is obscure. ("The Story of the Jewish Publication Society's New Translation of the Torah," *BT* 14 [1963] 106–13; the quote is from pp. 110–11).

The procedure described is in a way unfair to the reader, for it implies that the translators maneuvered the English language in order to make some sense of a passage that, according to their scholarly opinion, did not make sense. The NJPST is more cautious in its approach, for it goes as far as admitting that occasionally the text is corrupt. In such cases, the reading is described as "meaning of Heb. uncertain," explained as follows on p. xxv as "where the translation represents the best that the committee could achieve with an elusive or difficult text. In some cases the text may be unintelligible because of corruption."

[43] Admittedly, scholars can allow themselves the luxury of defending an abstract view, since they do not have to face an audience, as do the translators of the UBS and NJPST. At the same time, unconventional solutions can be devised to satisfy those audiences as well.

[44] See Tov, "Place of the Masoretic Text" and chapter 18*, § 4.

[45] This cautious approach is supported by an observation by Scanlin, "Traditional Hebrew Text" (see n. 43 above): "Surprisingly, 19th century Old Testament critics, whose names are virtually synonymous with emendation and reconstruction of the *Urtext*, were themselves cautious when dealing with the question of the textual basis of Old Testament translation."

or any complete Hebrew scroll from the Judean Desert. If the resulting translation of MT or the LXX is sometimes awkward, vague, or even erroneous (with corrective notes provided), C. Rabin[46] has taught us that the public has a high level of tolerance for unusual translations of Scripture.

[46] C. Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," *Textus* 6 (1968) 1–26, esp. 9–10.

Chapter Nine

The Copying of a Biblical Scroll

The copying of biblical scrolls was very similar or identical to that of nonbiblical scrolls (see § 2 below). Much information on this topic can now be distilled from the scrolls found in the Judean Desert.

1. The Scrolls[1]

The great majority of the biblical scrolls from the Judean Desert were written on parchment, while only 3–6 biblical texts were inscribed on papyrus. The first stage in the preparation of such parchment was the slaughtering of an animal and the preparation of its hide for the production of the scroll material. According to research carried out so far, the scrolls from the Judean Desert were prepared from hides of the following animals: calf, fine-wooled sheep, medium-wooled sheep, wild and domestic goats, gazelle, and ibex.

The *preparation* of the leather is described as follows by Bar-Ilan: "The hide was removed from the carcass and then soaked in a solution of salt and other agents in order to remove any remaining particles of hair and fat, then stretched, dried, smoothed with a rock, and treated with a tanning solution. This improved its appearance, and perhaps made it easier for the leather to absorb the ink. Next, the hide was cut into the longest possible rectangular sheet to serve as a scroll."[2] However, even the leftovers were used for writing: contrary to practice in later centuries, most of the *tefillin* found at Qumran were written on irregularly shaped pieces that clearly were leftovers from the preparation of large skins. Upon preparation, most skins were inscribed on the (hairy) outside layer (thus *Sof.* 1.8 and *y. Meg.* 1.71d), while 11QT[a] (11Q19) was inscribed on the inside of the skin (the flesh side). For parallels in rabbinic literature, see *y. Meg*. 1.71d: "One writes on the hairy side of the skin" (cf. *Massekhet Sefer Torah* 1.4).

The *length* of the composition was calculated approximately before commencing the writing, so that the required number of sheets could be ordered from a manufacturer or could be prepared to fit the size of the composition.

---

[1] Valuable information is found in J. Ashton, *The Persistence, Diffusion and Interchangeability of Scribal Habits in the Ancient Near East before the Codex,* unpubl. Ph.D. diss., University of Sydney, 1999. The present study updates and summarizes my *Scribal Practices*.

[2] M. Bar-Ilan, "Writing Materials," in *Encyclopedia DSS*, 2.996.

Subsequently, the individual sheets were ruled and inscribed and only afterwards stitched together. The fact that some ruled sheets were used as uninscribed handle sheets (e. g. the last sheets of 11QT[a] and 11QShirShabb) and that some uninscribed top margins were ruled (the second sheet of 1QpHab) shows that the ruling was sometimes executed without relation to the writing procedure of a specific scroll. The numbering of a few sheets preserved in the Judean Desert probably indicates that some or most sheets were inscribed separately, and joined subsequently according to the sequence of the numbers (however, the great majority of the sheets were not numbered).

The first step in the preparation of scrolls for writing was that of the *ruling* (scoring) that facilitated the inscription in straight lines; the writing was executed in such a way that the letters hung from the lines. This ruling provided graphical guidance for the writing, horizontal ruling for the individual lines, as well as vertical ruling for the beginning and/or end of the columns. The so-called blind or dry-point ruling was usually performed with a pointed instrument (such instruments have not been preserved), probably a bone, making a sharp crease in the parchment. As a result of this procedure, the leather was sometimes split and even broken off (e. g. 1QapGen ar XXI–XXII; 1QIsa[a] XXXVIII, XLVIII; 11QT[a] [11Q19] XVIII, XXII). It is unclear why some sheets are split more than others; it is not impossible that different materials, different skin preparation methods, or differing amounts of force used with these rulings may account for the differences. In a very few cases, the ruling was indicated by diluted ink.

Almost all Qumran and Masada texts written on leather in the square script had ruled horizontal lines in accordance with the practice for most literary texts written on parchment in Semitic languages and in Greek;[3] this was the continuation of an earlier practice used on cuneiform tablets, in lapidary inscriptions, and in papyrus and leather documents in various Semitic languages.

On the other hand, texts written on papyrus were not ruled (for Qumran, see, e. g. the Greek texts 4QpapLXXLev[b] [4Q120] and 4Qpap paraExod gr [4Q127]). Probably the horizontal and vertical fibers provided some form of guidance for the writing. Also, *tefillin* were not ruled; see the *tefillin* from the Judean Desert and the prescriptions in *b. Menaḥ.* 32b; *b. Meg.* 18b.

The ruling was sometimes applied with the aid of guide dots/strokes, or with a grid-like device (see below on 11QT[a]), while in other instances no device at all was used. These *guide dots* ("points jalons"), or sometimes strokes, were drawn in order to guide the drawing of dry lines. The dots or strokes were indicated in the left margin that followed the last column on a sheet, or in the right margin that preceded the first column as in 4QDeut[n], usually about 0.5–1.0 cm from the

[3] For a general introduction, see J. Leroy, *Les types de reglure des manuscrits grecs* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1976); Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, 4–5.

edge of the sheet; in a few instances they were placed further from the edge, e. g. MasSir V (2.5 cm), 2QpaleoLev (1.5 cm).

The guide dots/strokes were indicated by the persons who manufactured the scrolls rather than by the scribes themselves, who often wrote over them in the left margin (e. g. 4QGen-Exod[a] frg. 19 ii; 4QIsa[a] frg. 11 ii). Just as scribes often wrote beyond the left vertical line, they also wrote very close to these dots, on the dots, and even beyond them. As a result, the distance between the dots/strokes and the left edge of the writing differs not only from scroll to scroll, but also within the scroll, and even within the column. On the other hand, dots indicated to the right of the column are always spaced evenly within the manuscript. The guide dots/strokes usually appear level with the tops of the letters, which is the same level as the ruled lines.

Each sheet was ruled separately, usually without reference to the preceding and following sheets; compare e. g. 11QtgJob XXXI (last column of sheet 11) with the next column, XXXII (first column of sheet 12) and 11QT[a] (11Q19) XLVIII (last column of a sheet) with col. XLIX (first column of a sheet). However in some scrolls a grid-like device ensuring identical spacing in adjacent columns must have been used for one or more sheets. Thus the unequal spacing between the ruled lines of 4QpsEzek[c] (4Q385b) frg. 1, i–iii, in which the distance between lines 2 and 3 is larger than that between the other lines in all three adjacent columns, shows that all the columns in the sheet were ruled at the same time or with the same device. This pertains also to 11QT[a] (11Q19) in which several sheets must have been ruled with the same grid (three sheets containing cols. XLV–LVI), while subsequent sheets (two sheets containing cols. LXI–LXVI) were ruled with a completely different grid, leaving more space between the lines. In any event, within each column and sheet, no fixed spaces between the lines were left. See, for example, the different levels of the lines in some adjacent columns in the same sheet in 1QIsa[a], e. g. in col. XIII compared with cols. XII and XIV.

The technique of ruling, prescribed by Talmudic sources for sacred scrolls, is named שרטוט (*b. Shabb.* 75b; *b. Meg.* 18b). In Palestinian texts it is referred to as "one rules with a reed" (*y. Meg.* 1.71d; *Sof.* 1.1).

The most frequently used system of vertical ruling pertains to both the beginning (right side) and end (left side) of the column. The horizontal margin lines at the end of a column together with the vertical lines to the right of the next column indicate the structure of the columns and the intercolumnar margins. For some examples, see 1QIsa[a], 1QIsa[b], 4QpaleoGen-Exod[l], 4QpaleoExod[m], 4QNum[b], 4QQoh[a], 6QCant, 11QpaleoLev[a], MasPs[a], and MasSir. Usually the vertical lines are more or less perpendicular to the horizontal lines, creating a rectangular shape.

Vertical rules at the left side of the block helped scribes to obtain a straight left margin, but generally scribes writing texts in square characters did not adhere properly to it. Since words were not split in the square script, sometimes other

means were devised to obtain a straight left margin, mainly: (1) Leaving wider spaces between words toward the end of the lines (proportional spacing), so that the ends of the lines would be flush with the left marginal line; (2) cramming letters in at the ends of the lines or writing them in a smaller size in the line itself; (3) writing of parts of words at the end of the line, to be repeated in full on the next line.

In a few cases, a *double vertical ruling* was applied to the right of the columns, especially before the first column on the sheet (e. g. 4QNum^{b}). Such ruling was performed with two dry lines, spaced a few millimeters apart, while the writing started after the second vertical line. The technique may have been used for purposes of neatness, and in the case of the ruling on the left side it would ensure that the scribe observed the left margin.

The ruling may have been executed by the scribes, but it is more likely that it was applied by the manufacturers of the scroll without reference to the text to be inscribed, as indicated by several discrepancies between the inscribed text and the ruled lines, such as a larger number of ruled lines than inscribed text (see 4QDeut^{n}).

Most literary texts from the Judean Desert were ruled, and in the great majority of these texts, the letters were suspended from horizontal lines in such a way that the text was written flush with these lines. In a few Qumran texts, the letters are often written slightly below the lines, e. g. in 11QT^{a} (11Q19) cols. XLV–XLVIII and 4QXII^{g} leaving a space of 0.1 cm, and 4QHodayot-like Text C (4Q440) at a distance of 0.2 cm. In other texts, scribes disregarded the guidance of the ruled lines.

The preparation of the material for writing included not just the ruling, but also the preparation of the surface for writing in *columns*. The number of columns per sheet and their sizes differed from scroll to scroll, sometimes from sheet to sheet, and they depended much on the size of the sheets and the scroll.

The size of the scroll depended on the contents and the dimensions of the sheets. At Qumran, the length of most sheets of leather varied between 21 and 90 cm. The natural limitations of the sizes of animal hides determined the different lengths of these sheets within each scroll, which varied more in some scrolls than in others. In two instances (MurXII, 11QpaleoLev^{a}), the preserved sheets are more or less of the same length.

The inscribed surface was usually organized in the form of a column; this was always the case in literary compositions. In texts consisting of more than one column, these columns always follow one another. Only one document is known, 4QIncantation (4Q444), in which three tiny fragments of parchment (each containing four lines) were stitched together vertically, but also in this case the groups of four lines constitute a single column. In the case of 4QApocr. Psalm and Prayer (4Q448), the different arrangement of the columns probably derived from the adhesion of a reinforcement tab that necessitated a large margin at the beginning of the scroll (col. A).

There is a positive correlation between the length and the width of columns: the higher the column, the wider the lines, and the longer the scroll.

The *sizes of the columns* differ in accordance with the number of columns per sheet, the measurements of the sheets, and the conventions developed by the scroll manufacturers. The different parameters of the columns pertain to their width and length as well as to the top, bottom, and intercolumnar margins.

In some Qumran scrolls, the height and width of the columns are fairly consistent, while in most scrolls these parameters varied from sheet to sheet as well as within each sheet, in accordance with the measurements of the sheets. Thus the width of some columns in 1QM and 4QLam differs by as much as 50 percent from other columns in the same scrolls. Considerable differences between the width of the columns are visible in 11QT[a] (11Q19) and 8ḤevXIIgr, while even larger ones are evident in 1QIsa[a] (cf. col. XLIX [16.3 cm] with LII [8.8 cm]), 1QS (cf. cols. I [9.7 cm] and II [11.5 cm] with other columns measuring 16, 18 and 19 cm) and 4QLam (col. III is almost twice as wide as cols. I and II). At the same time, a degree of regularity in column sizes is noticeable in most scrolls. Usually, the available space in a sheet was evenly divided between the columns, but the unusual sizes of the sheets did not always allow for such uniformity. Columns that are unusually wide or narrow are generally found at the beginning or end of sheets.

The average width of columns in 1QM is 15.0 cm, in 1QH[a] 13.0 cm, and in 1QS 9.5–15.5 cm. An example of a scroll with very wide columns is 4QJer[b] with 21–24 cm (115–130 letter-spaces; reconstructed). An example of a scroll with narrow columns is 4QMMT[a] (4Q394) frgs. 1–2 i–iv with a width of 1.7–2.0 cm (probably reflecting a separate composition, 4QCal. Doc. D[4]). Furthermore, all the poetical compositions presenting the text stichographically with hemistichs, such as most columns of 4QPs[b] written in units measuring *c.* 3.7–4.5 cm, present narrow columns.

The *average number of lines* per column in Qumran scrolls is probably 20, with a height of approximately 14–15 cm (including the top and bottom margins). Larger scrolls contained columns with between 25 and as many as 60 lines. Scrolls of the smallest dimensions contained merely 5–13 lines and their height was similarly small.

Among the scrolls with a large writing block one finds many texts from Qumran, as well as *all* the scrolls from Masada, Naḥal Ḥever, Sdeir, and Murabbaʿat that can be measured. The latter group of sites contains scrolls that are usually somewhat later than those found at Qumran. The *terminus ad quem* for the Masada texts is more or less identical to that of Qumran, yet the Qumran finds include earlier texts. The texts from Naḥal Ḥever, Sdeir, Murabbaʿat have as their *terminus ad quem* the Second Jewish Revolt. The manuscript evidence from these sites thus may attest to a later practice: MurGen-Num (*c.* 50 lines); MurXII (39

[4] See S. Talmon with J. Ben-Dov, *DJD* XXI.

lines); Sdeir Gen (*c.* 40 lines); 8ḤevXIIgr (42–45 lines); as well as all the Masada texts for which such evidence is known: MasSir (25 lines); MasLev^{b} (25 lines); MasShirShabb (26 lines); MasEzek (42 lines); MasDeut (42 lines); MasPs^{b} (44 or 45 lines). The evidence suggests that the scribal traditions at these sites were for writing on scrolls of larger dimensions than the average Qumran scroll. This situation may be connected with specific manufacturing procedures, but more likely the data reflect the finding of *de luxe* editions of biblical scrolls at these sites, all of which were of a large format.

The same compositions were often written on scrolls of differing sizes, although in some cases a degree of regularity is visible.

All texts whether written on scraps, single sheets, or scrolls were copied with clearly indicated *margins* on all sides of the text; *tefillin* are the exception, where every available space was used for writing. Even 4Q339 (4QList of False Prophets ar), a very small piece of leather, has very clearly recognizable margins (top, bottom, left).

The margins in the Qumran scrolls are usually the same size within each sheet. There are rare exceptions where the margins differ from column to column within a sheet, and sometimes from sheet to sheet, due to the leather not being uniform in size. In the Qumran leather and papyrus texts, the bottom margins are usually larger than those at the top. However, in some cases the two margins are identical or the top margin is larger. Large margins, especially large bottom margins, enabled easy handling of the scroll and were therefore prescribed for Scripture by rabbinic sources, see *b. Menaḥ.* 30a (cf. *Massekhet Sefer Torah* 2.4). In Qumran scrolls, it is usual for the top margins to measure 1.0–2.0 cm, and the bottom margins 2.0–3.0 cm. Larger margins, especially in late texts, usually are a sign of a *de luxe* format.

All biblical texts were inscribed on one side only, while several nonbiblical texts were inscribed on both sides (opisthographs).

2. The Scribes

Little is known about the Qumran scribes and they remain as anonymous as they were two generations ago. Scribes were introduced to their trade over the course of a training period in which they learned writing and the various scribal procedures connected with it (such as writing at a fixed distance below ruled lines and in columns; the subdivision of a composition into sense units; the treatment of the divine names; the correction of mistakes, etc.). Furthermore, scribes had to master various technical skills relating to the material on which they wrote, the use of writing implements, and the preparation of ink.

The abecedaries found at Qumran,[5] Murabba'at,[6] Masada (ostraca 606 and 608), and at many additional sites dating to the period of the First and Second Temples[7] probably witness to such a learning process for scribes. A learning process is possibly also reflected in such scribal exercises as 4QExercitium Calami A (4Q234), B (4Q360), and C (4Q341) that contain lists of names and other words. Certain Qumran documents, written with very inelegant and irregular handwriting, were considered by some scholars to have been written by apprentice scribes. Thus Milik, *Enoch*, 141 considered 4QEn[a] ar (4Q201) to be a "school-exercise copied by a young scribe from the master's dictation." Skehan considered 4QPs[x] (4Q98g) to be a "practice page written from memory,"[8] Milik considered 4QDanSuz? ar (4Q551) to have been written by an apprentice scribe,[9] and Puech suggested that 4QBirth of Noah[a] ar (4Q534) was written by a child.[10]

It is hard to know how many of the texts found in the Judean Desert were actually produced locally, that is, both their physical preparation and the copying of the manuscripts. Undoubtedly at least some of the leather scrolls were produced locally (as can in due course be proved with DNA analysis comparing the scrolls with hides of local animals, both ancient and present-day), but at present this cannot be ascertained. It is also impossible to know whether the production of papyrus was local (Ein Feschkha or elsewhere in Israel), or whether the papyri were imported from Egypt.

Qumran. If it could be proven that locus 30 at Qumran served as a room in which documents were written (a scriptorium in medieval terminology),[11] the assumption of a Qumran scribal school would receive welcome support, but the reliability of the evidence pointing to the existence of such a scriptorium is

[5] See Kh. Qumran Ostr. 3 published by E. Eshel in *DJD* XXXVIII. Two additional abecedaries, described as deriving from the first century BCE, are displayed in the Israel Museum as "Qumran?"

[6] Some of the abecedaries from Murabba'at were written on parchment (Mur 10B, 11), while others were inscribed on sherds (Mur 73, 78–80), all published in *DJD* II.

[7] See É. Puech, "Abécédaire et liste alphabétique de noms hébreux du début des IIe S. A. D." *RB* 87 (1980) 118–26; A. Lemaire, *Les écoles et la formation de la Bible dans l'ancien Israël* (OBO 39; Fribourg/Göttingen: Editions universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 7–32; M. Haran, "On the Diffusion of Literacy and Schools in Ancient Israel," *VTSup* 40 (1988) 81–95; J. Renz and W. Röllig, *Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik* 2 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995) 22–5; W. Nebe, "Alphabets," *Encyclopedia DSS*, 1.18–20.

[8] P. W. Skehan, "Gleanings from Psalm Texts from Qumran," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (ed. A. Caquot and M. Delcor; AOAT 212; Neukirchen/Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981) 439–52 (439).

[9] J. T. Milik, "Daniel et Susanne à Qumrân?" in *De la Tôrah au Messie* (ed. M. Carrez et al.; Paris: Desclée, 1981) 337–59, esp. 355.

[10] *DJD* XXXI, 135.

[11] Thus the majority of scholars ever since the description by R. de Vaux, *L'archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961) 23–6; idem, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy; London 1973) 29–33; see also R. Reich, "A Note on the Function of Room 30 (the "Scriptorium") at Khirbet Qumran," *JJS* 46 (1995) 157–60.

questionable. Beyond the archeological relevance of locus 30, most scholars now believe, on the basis of the content of the scrolls, that some, many, or all of the documents found at Qumran were copied locally.

Stegemann holds a maximalistic view on this issue, assuming that most Qumran scrolls were written on site.[12] According to him, one of the main occupations of the Qumran community was the preparation of parchment for writing and the mass-production of written texts. These texts were then sold by the Qumran community to the outside world, and Stegemann pinpoints the places in the community buildings in which the scrolls were manufactured, stored, and offered for sale.[13] Golb, expressing a minimalist view, claimed that none of the Qumran documents were written locally.[14]

Masada. There is no reason to believe that any of the Masada texts were penned at Masada itself, even though the Zealots and presumably also the Essenes remained there long enough to have embarked upon such writing. On the other hand, there is apparently some evidence of tanning of hides at Masada, which could imply some scribal activity.[15]

Probably only the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek ostraca were written at Masada prior to the destruction of the fortress. The Latin ostraca and some Greek papyri were probably inscribed under the Roman occupation, and other papyrus and leather texts may have been imported.

Because of the lack of external information on the scribes who copied or wrote the documents found in the Judean Desert, our sole source of information about them is the scribal activity reflected in the documents themselves. Whether a text under discussion is a copy of an earlier document or an autograph, the scribal practices reflected in it do provide information that is relevant to the study of these scribal practices. However, in the analysis of these practices it is often difficult to distinguish between the personal input of the scribes and elements transmitted to them. Thus, the division into sense units and the specific layout of poetical units embedded in the Qumran texts probably derive from the first copies of these compositions, although in the transmission of these elements scribes displayed a certain level of individuality. The more closely scribes adhered to the scribal practices embedded in the texts from which they were copying, the less the texts reflected their own initiatives. In another case, the number of lines per

---

[12] Stegemann, *Library,* 51–5.

[13] This theory was rejected in a detailed analysis by F. Rohrhirsch, *Wissenschaftstheorie und Qumran: die Geltungsbegrundungen von Ausssagen in der Biblischen Archäologie am Beispiel von Chirbet Qumran und En Feschcha* (NTOA 32; Freiburg: Universitatsverlag Göttingen, 1996), and idem, "Die Geltungsbegründungen der Industrie-Rollen-Theorie zu Chirbet Qumran und En Feschcha auf dem methodologischen Prüfstand: Relativierung und Widerlegung," *DSD* 6 (1999) 267–81.

[14] N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1994).

[15] See E. Netzer, *Masada III,* 634–5.

column probably was determined more by scroll manufacturers than by scribes. Scribes could choose between scrolls of different sizes, and probably ordered a scroll size to fit a specific composition. In the case of small-sized scrolls, such as the copies of the Five Scrolls, it was probably not the individual scribe but rather tradition that determined that short compositions were to be written on scrolls of limited dimensions. On the other hand, some practices and approaches were very much exponents of the individuality of scribes: handwriting, frequency of errors, correction procedures, the indication of sense divisions, scribal markings, use of final and non-final letters, adherence to horizontal and vertical ruling, special layout of poetical units, as well as the choice of the base text.

Several scrolls were penned by more than one scribe, especially among texts presumably written by the Qumran scribal school. It is difficult to know how many long scrolls were written by more than one scribe. Probably the rule was that each scroll, long or short, was written by a single scribe, and the involvement of more than one scribe was the exception rather than the rule. Not only 1QIsa^{a}, a long scroll, but also 4QApocr. Psalm and Prayer (4Q448), a short scroll, was written by two different scribes. Changes of hand in the middle of the text are recognizable in several documents, but the background of these changes is often not readily understandable. In some cases, both scribes wrote a substantial part of the scroll (1QIsa^{a}), while in other cases the second scribe wrote very little (1QpHab, 1QH^{a} scribes A–C, 1QS, 11QT^{a}).

Whether in these cases the change of hand indicates a collaboration of some kind between scribes, possibly within the framework of a scribal school, is difficult to tell. Sometimes (4QJub^{a}), the second hand may reflect a corrective passage or a repair sheet. The situation becomes even more difficult to understand when the hand of a scribe B or C is recognized not only in independently written segments, but also in the correction of the work of a scribe A. Thus, according to Martin, scribe C of 1QH^{a} corrected the work of scribe A, while scribe B corrected that of both scribes A and C.[16]

It is difficult to identify scribal hands solely by an analysis of handwriting and other scribal features, but if our lack of knowledge is taken into consideration, one notes that among the Qumran manuscripts very few individual scribes can be identified as having copied more than one manuscript. It stands to reason that several of the preserved manuscripts were written by the same scribe, but we are not able to easily detect such links between individual texts, partly because of the fragmentary status of the evidence and partly because of the often formal character of the handwriting. However, convincing evidence is available for a few scribes, such as the scribe who wrote 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb, and the biblical text 4QSam^{c}, and his hand is also visible in several corrections in another biblical text, 1QIsa^{a} (see chapter 5*, § 3). The identification of this scribal hand also serves to

[16] Martin, *Scribal Character,* I.63.

show that, at least in this case, biblical and nonbiblical texts were copied by the same person, and that he treated both texts in the same way. There also is no indication that *tefillin* were copied by different scribes, therefore indicating that the category of scribes who specialized in sacred writings developed later, or only in rabbinic circles.

The existence of *scribal schools* cannot easily be proven. A close relationship among the various manuscripts of the MT family is often surmised by scholars. Whether or not this textual closeness also implies a separate scribal school needs to be established by different types of criteria. Although it is likely that these manuscripts were indeed created by a single scribal school, the relevant criteria for setting these manuscripts apart from other texts still need to be formulated. The proto-Masoretic manuscripts are characterized by minimal scribal intervention and a *de luxe* format. At the same time, the existence of a Qumran scribal school is often surmised.[17] The criteria used for this assumption are in the realm of orthography, morphological features, and special scribal practices. Thus, it can be shown that the employment of cancellation dots, crossing out with a line, scribal signs, and several other scribal features is especially frequent in texts that display specific orthographical and morphological features, and which include almost exclusively all the Qumran sectarian texts as well as some biblical texts. The inclusion of phylacteries with a special non-Rabbinic (and therefore probably Qumran sectarian) content in this group is also remarkable. It has therefore been suggested that a special scribal school wrote these texts at Qumran or elsewhere, although this remains speculative. Nothing is known about the training within this school or scribal cooperation, although there are a few manuscripts that were written within this scribal tradition, and supplemented by a second scribe who also wrote in the same tradition. There are differences in scribal habits within this group, which may indicate that writing was carried out over the course of several periods.

Study of the scribal practices reflected in the texts from the Judean Desert compared with descriptions and prescriptions of such practices in rabbinic literature is helpful as long as it is recognized that the latter refer to the writing of religious texts at a later period, and in circles that only partially overlapped with those that produced the texts found in the Judean Desert. Thus, probably only the biblical texts of Masoretic character, some *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, and possibly the paleo-Hebrew texts from the Judean Desert, which partly overlap with the proto-Masoretic text group, derived from the same or similar circles as those issuing the rabbinic prescriptions.

The rabbinic writing instructions pertaining to very specific details are scattered within the rabbinic literature, while some are combined in small compilations dealing with different topics, such as *b. Menaḥ.* 29b–32b; *b. Meg.* passim;

[17] See *Scribal Practices*, 261–73 and chapter 27* below.

b. Shabb. 103a–105a; *b. B. Bat.* 13b–14b. The internally best-organized group of such instructions is found in *y. Meg.* 1.71b–72a, and in the post-Talmudic compilation *Massekhet Soferim*. Many scribal practices reflected in the Qumran texts are covered by instructions or descriptions in the rabbinic sources. A comparison between the Qumran texts and rabbinic literature is hampered by the internal variety within both the Qumran literature and the rabbinic sources. The comparison can be applied only to books to which the rabbinic rules could apply, namely Scripture, *tefillin*, and *mezuzot*.

3. The Copying Itself

The ink used for writing the texts inscribed in some scrolls from the Judean Desert has been analyzed. On the basis of examinations carried out on several fragments from caves 1 and 4 in 1995, Nir-El and Broshi concluded that no metal ink was used in writing the Qumran scrolls.[18] These scholars assumed that the copper elements found in the ink used for the papyrus and parchment fragments derived from copper inkwells used by scribes, and that the ink itself was carbon based.

That different types of black ink were used is clear from the differing states of preservation of ink in the manuscripts. While in most cases the ink is very well preserved, on some scrolls it has corroded and eaten through the leather, often creating the impression of a photographic negative. This is the case with 1QapGen ar, 4QpaleoExod^{m}, 4QExod-Lev^{f}, 4QLev^{d}, and 4QDan^{d}. According to Cross, the ink has etched the leather "presumably because of some residual acid in the ink from its storage in a metal inkwell."[19] On the other hand, according to Nir-El and Broshi (see n. 18), this deterioration was caused by the agents used to bind the carbon-based ink, such as "vegetable gum, animal size, oil or honey."

In addition, red ink was used in the first lines of Psalm 103 in 2QPs, at the beginning of new paragraphs in 4QNum^{b}, as well as in two nonbiblical compositions. Nir-El and Broshi suggested that the red ink is composed of mercury sulfide (cinnabar), imported to Palestine from Spain through Rome.[20]

Ink was stored in *inkwells*, two of which were found by R. de Vaux in locus 30 at Qumran, the so-called scriptorium, one made of ceramic and one of bronze (both were exhibited in the Jordan Archaeological Museum in Amman in 1997).[21] A third inkwell, made of ceramic and also found by de Vaux, came from

[18] Y. Nir-El and M. Broshi, "The Black Ink of the Qumran Scrolls," *DSD* 3 (1996) 157–67.

[19] F. M. Cross, *DJD* XII, 133.

[20] Y. Nir-El and M. Broshi, "The Red Ink of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Archaeometry* 38 (1996) 97–102.

[21] See S. Goranson, "Qumran: A Hub of Scribal Activity," *BAR* 20, 5 (1994) 36–9; idem, "An Inkwell from Qumran," *Michmanim* 6 (1992) 37–40 (Heb.).

locus 31,[22] a fourth one, found by Steckoll, came from an unspecified place at Qumran,[23] and a possible fifth one is mentioned by Goranson, "Inkwell." There are dried ink remains in two of these inkwells.[24]

When writing, the scribe would copy from a written text. It is not impossible that some scribes wrote from dictation[25] or that mass production (dictating to several scribes at the same time) took place, but there is no evidence supporting this view. Phonetic interchange of letters as evidenced in many Qumran texts does not necessarily prove that they were written by dictation, since any scribe copying from a document could make phonetic mistakes or change the orthography, whether consciously or not.[26]

Little is known about the *pens* used for writing the texts from the Judean Desert, as these have not been preserved. The pens used were probably of the *calamus* (κάλαμος) type, made from reed. Pfann notes with regard to the pens used for the texts written in the Cryptic A script: "For the most part a reed pen tip, that had been carefully honed to have a rectangular cut tip, was used, which allowed the scribe to produce strokes with shading (normally vertical or slightly diagonal) depending upon the direction of the stroke. At other times another more or less round or square-tipped pen was used, which produced strokes with little or no shading."[27]

It is unknown in what position the writing was executed, but most probably scribes were seated either on a bench or on the ground, while holding the sheet on a board on their knees, similar to the position of Egyptian scribes. In *locus* 30 at Qumran, archeologists found a table five meters in length, two small "tables," a few small benches fixed to the wall, and several inkwells (cf. PAM 42.865), which were situated either in this room or on a second floor that according to some scholars was situated above this room.[28] However, doubts have been raised with regard to this assumption. Several scholars have claimed that the table is too low (70 cm) for writing.[29] Besides, real evidence for the writing at tables is

---

[22] R. de Vaux, "Fouilles au Khirbet Qumran: Rapport préliminaire sur la dernière campagne," *RB* 61 (1954) 206–33, esp. 212 and pls. 5, 6, and 10b. For further information on inkwells found in ancient Israel, see Goranson, "Inkwell," 38 (see n. 21).

[23] S. H. Steckoll, "Marginal Notes on the Qumran Excavations," *RevQ* 7 (1969) 33–40, esp. 35.

[24] See further M. Broshi, "Inkwells," *Encyclopedia DSS*, 375.

[25] Thus with regard to 1QIsa[a]: M. Burrows, "Orthography, Morphology, and Syntax of the St. Mark's Manuscript," *JBL* 68 (1949) 195–211, esp. 196; H. M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript," *JBL* 69 (1950) 149–66, esp. 165.

[26] Thus already E. Hammershaimb, reacting to the theories regarding 1QIsa[a]: "On the Method Applied in the Copying of Manuscripts in Qumran," *VT* 9 (1959) 415–8.

[27] S. J. Pfann, *DJD* XXXVI, 520.

[28] See M. Broshi, "Scriptorium," *Encyclopedia DSS*, 2.831.

[29] See B. M. Metzger, "The Furniture of the Scriptorium at Qumran," *RevQ* 1 (1958) 509–15; K. G. Pedley, "The Library at Qumran," *RevQ* 2 (1959) 21–41, esp. 35; K. W. Clark, "The Posture of the Ancient Scribe," *BA* 26 (1963) 63–72.

not available until several centuries after Qumran was abandoned. The so-called "tables" probably were not strong enough to support people either sitting or writing on them.

Scribes writing in the square script wrote a running text with spaces between the words (except for *tefillin*), while in some cases they would join two closely connected words without such spaces. At the same time, in texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script, words were separated by little dots or strokes in accordance with the writing tradition in that script.

Some poetical sections were arranged stichographically in different systems of a special graphical presentation of the stichs and hemistichs indicated by spacing, but most texts, including poetry, were written as prose (running texts). Scribes would also leave occasional spaces for section breaks based on the content: closed sections in the line for smaller breaks, open sections usually for larger breaks, and for even larger breaks a combination of an open section and a completely empty line. As a result, scribes must have had a good understanding of the composition, although often these spaces would have been copied from their sources. Units smaller than sections, known as "verses," such as indicated in the medieval manuscripts, belonged to the oral tradition, and were not indicated in written Hebrew sources, although they were indicated in the contemporary copies of the Greek and Aramaic Bible translations.

The Qumran scribes had a special approach towards the writing of divine names, especially the Tetragrammaton. In texts written in square characters, especially in texts probably produced by the Qumran scribal school (see n. 17), the use of the Tetragrammaton was usually avoided, but when it was used, it was copied in the paleo-Hebrew script, also in some biblical scrolls. Likewise, אל, אלהים, and צבאות were sometimes written in that script. There are indications that in some scrolls these divine names were written after the scribe of the manuscript completed his task, possibly by a scribe belonging to a higher echelon. In several other texts, four or five dots were used to indicate the Tetragrammaton.

Scribes made all the types of *mistakes* that may be expected from any copyist (omissions of small and large elements, duplication, writing of wrong words and letters, mistakes in matters of sequence). Obviously, some scribes erred more than others. For example, 1QIsa[a] contains more errors than most other scrolls. Many of these mistakes were left in the text, while some were corrected by the original scribe, or a later scribe or reader. Letters could not be washed off from leather, as they could from papyrus, so other techniques had to be used: (1) removal of a written element by way of erasure or blotting out, crossing out, or marking with cancellation dots or with a box; (2) addition of an element in the interlinear space or, rarely, in the intercolumnar margin; (3) remodeling (reshaping) of an existing letter to another one; (4) changing the spacing between words either by indicating that the last letter of a word belonged to the next word (beyond the

space) or that there should be a space between two words that had been written as one continuous unit. All these procedures together may be named "scribal intervention," which is more frequent in some texts and less so in "luxury scrolls," partly because it was less needed in such carefully written scrolls. However, the exponent of scribal intervention pertains not only to the correction of mistakes, but also to the insertion of scribal changes in the text.

As can be seen clearly, many of the corrections indicated in the manuscripts were inserted by the original scribes in the middle of the copying process. In most cases, however, it cannot be determined who inserted the corrections, and the handwriting is not a good indication in the case of small corrections. Later scribes or readers also must have corrected the texts, either from memory, or by comparison with the text from which the scroll was copied or with another scroll. In the case of the biblical texts, there is no proof that scrolls were corrected on the basis of an authoritative scroll.

All the letters and words added between the lines correct existing elements in the text, mainly by way of addition. The technique of adding explicating glosses or variants was not used in the known scrolls. By the same token, these scrolls exhibit no parallels to the Masoretic *Ketiv/Qere* system known from the Talmud and medieval manuscripts (see chapter 14*).

In the course of the correction procedure, scribes used special signs for canceling letters or words (especially cancellation dots, crossing out with a line), and in addition to these signs some manuscripts contain several scribal markings, mainly in the margins. These signs are especially frequent in 1QIsa^{a} and 1QS, and were probably inserted by readers rather than scribes. The scrolls also display additional types of signs. The most frequently used sign, a straight line written mainly in the margin under the last line of a section (*paragraphos*), usually indicates the end of an open section, but occasionally that of a closed section. The varying shapes of these *paragraphoi* show that they were inserted by more than one person. Another such sign resembles an X, and probably designates a paragraph or issue for special attention. A variety of other signs are no longer intelligible, among them letters in the paleo-Hebrew and cryptic-A scripts that were written in the margins of 1QIsa^{a} and a few additional texts. Some of these letters probably carry a sectarian message, but they may also pertain to the public reading from the scroll.

The Qumran scribes wrote in the square script in Hebrew, and there is no certainty that the Aramaic texts and the biblical texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script were also copied by them. These texts may have been imported to Qumran, just like the Greek Bible texts found there; nothing points to the Qumran community's knowledge of Greek apart from the fact that one or more of the members, who probably knew Greek, had brought such texts with them.

4. After the Writing

Upon completing the inscribing of the composition, the scribe or manufacturer would join the sheets to form a scroll. When combining the sheets, they made an effort to align adjacent sheets so that the lines of writing would appear at the same level (most of the fifty-four columns in 1QIsa[a]). However, when the columns were positioned at a slightly different height in adjacent sheets, the lines in these sheets often were not continuous. This explains the differences in height between the columns in the adjacent sheets of 1QS; 4QDeut[n] sheets 1 (col. I) and 2 (cols. II–VI; in this composition the bottoms of the two sheets were cut evenly after the two sheets were combined); 11QtgJob VIIB–VIII, XVII–XVIII, XXXI–XXXII, XXXV–XXXVI (however, the writing in cols. XIX–XX is at the same level); 11QpaleoLev[a].

According to rabbinic prescriptions, scroll sheets are to be sewn together with sinews from the same ritually clean cattle or wild animals from which the scroll itself was prepared. Cf. *b. Menaḥ.* 31b ("only with sinews, but not with thread") and *Sof.* 1.1 (see further *y. Meg.* 1.71d). The evidence suggests that most of the stitching material in the Qumran scrolls indeed consists of sinews. However, in his edition of 4QNum[b], Jastram concluded that the unraveling of the thread preceding col. XV (frg. 22b) suggested that it consisted of flax rather than sinews.[30] Further investigation should be able to determine which threads were made of animal sinews and which of flax, in the latter case contrary to rabbinic custom.

The completed document is a *scroll* (roll). In biblical and rabbinic Hebrew, a scroll is named מגילה (e. g. Jer 36:28; Ezek 3:1) or מגילת ספר (Jer 36:2, 4, 6; Ezek 2:9; Ps 40:8). In the Qumran scrolls, this phrase occurs in 4QWays of Righteousness[b] (4Q421) frg. 8 2, while מגילה alone occurs in 4QprEsth[b] (4Q550a), line 5. To the best of our knowledge, scrolls were used from very early times onwards, and therefore the original copies of all books of the Bible must have been written in scrolls. Hence, the insistence in Jewish tradition on this being the earliest form of the *Torah* has much to commend it.

Scrolls of all dimensions could be rolled (גלל, e. g. *m. Yoma* 7.1; *m. Sota* 7.7; πτύσσω Luke 4:17) easily, and upon completion of the reading they could be rolled back to the beginning (ἀναπτύσσω Luke 4:20), so that the first sheet of the scroll or its uninscribed handle sheet remained the external layer. By the same token, when a reader had finished in the middle section of a scroll or in any sheet thereafter, it was easier for him to roll it to the end, so that upon reopening the scroll he could roll it back.

Parchment scrolls were *closed or fastened* in three different ways:

a. Many scrolls were fastened with *thongs* (inserted in reinforcing tabs) or strings tied around them. In the words of Carswell, "The fastening of each scroll

[30] N. Jastram, *DJD* XII, 217.

appears to have consisted of two elements, a reinforcing tab of leather folded over the leading edge of the scroll and a leather thong slotted through it, one end of which encircled the scroll and was tied to the exterior."[31] A tool such as KhQ 2393 may have been used for this purpose.[32] The thong was connected to a reinforcing tab stuck to the scroll itself, in such a way that the thong was tied either straight or diagonally around the scroll (thus 4QD[a] [4Q266]).

Many detached reinforcing tabs made of coarse leather, differing from the finer leather of the inscribed scrolls, were found in the Qumran caves.[33] In cave 8, archeologists discovered sixty-eight such reinforcing tabs, usually of coarse leather, together with remains of only four manuscripts. Since each reinforcing tab was once attached to a single scroll, this cave probably contained a leather workshop or depository, unless it originally contained an equal number of scrolls and reinforcing tabs, with most of the scrolls having subsequently disintegrated. In only two cases have scrolls with attached reinforcement tabs been preserved, namely, 4QApocr. Psalm and Prayer (4Q448) and 4QD[a].[34]

Scrolls could also be tied with single strings or thongs not connected to a reinforcing tab, and some of these strings could have been passed through holes in the leather of the scroll or a cover sheet. According to Broshi and Yardeni, the tiny fragment 4QList of False Prophets (4Q339) was folded and held together by a string passed through holes that are still visible on the fragment.[35]

b. Several scrolls were protected by *linen wrappings*. Remnants of wrappings that had become detached from the scrolls were found in caves 1 and 11. A part of a scroll was found in cave 1 with its wrapper still around it and with the parchment stuck to a broken jar shard.[36] Some of the linen fragments found in the same cave probably derived from such wrappings. 1QIsa[a] was also once covered with a linen wrapping.[37]

The linen fragments from this cave are both dyed and non-dyed, and both with and without rectangular patterns. The use of linen wrappings for scrolls is referred to in *m. Kil.* 9.3 and *m. Kel.* 28.4 ("wrappers for scrolls") and in *y. Meg.* 1.71d ("cover"), for which Crowfoot mentioned some parallels from the classical world. The references in the Talmudic literature pertaining to wrappers with

[31] J. Carswell, "Fastenings on the Qumran Manuscripts," *DJD* VI, 23–8 (23).

[32] See *DJD* VI, 25.

[33] See Carswell, "Fastenings," *DJD* VI, 23–8 and pl. V.

[34] See *DJD* VI, pls. IVa–IVb and *DJD* XVIII, pls. I, XIV. Even if only two thongs were found attached to the scrolls, there is still much evidence of their use, visible in the imprint of the thongs or strings on the leather itself, creating a horizontal fold in the middle of most columns of 1QpHab, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb, 1QIsa[a].

[35] M. Broshi and A. Yardeni, *DJD* XIX, 77.

[36] *DJD* I, pl. I, 8–10.

[37] See the evidence quoted by G. M. Crowfoot, *DJD* I, 18–19.

figures portrayed on them may be similar to some of the linen fragments from cave 1 (rectangular patterns and blue elements).[38]

c. In a combination of the two aforementioned systems, some scrolls were both wrapped with linen and tied with a leather thong. One of the linen fragments from cave 4 (Israel Museum photograph X94.920) was attached to such a leather thong and together they must have surrounded a scroll. This system is not otherwise known from the literature. If the evidence mentioned under systems *a* and *b* for 1QIsa[a] is correct, that scroll was also tied with a combination of two systems.

Various practices were employed at the *beginnings and ends* of scrolls. The beginnings, or parts thereof, of a number of texts from Qumran (fifty-one or 5.5% of all the preserved scrolls) and from the other sites in the Judean Desert (2 scrolls) have been preserved. The ends of a smaller number of scrolls have been preserved (twenty-nine from Qumran [3.1% of the total scrolls from that site] and two from Masada). It is probably no coincidence that for a large percentage of the texts from cave 11 (six of the twenty-one texts from that cave, disregarding the small unidentified fragments), one of the two extremities has been preserved, in this case always the ending. This implies that there were relatively favorable storage conditions in that cave (see chapter 27*).

At the beginning of the first sheet, the scribe often left an uninscribed area for handling the scroll (see 4QGen[b]), which was always larger than the intercolumnar margin (usually 1.0–1.5 cm), and sometimes as wide as a whole column. This blank area at the beginning of the scroll was generally unruled, although in eight instances the surface was ruled up to the right edge. This system was imitated in the Copper Scroll (3Q15), in which the first column was preceded by a handling area 6.0 cm in width. In other cases, a separate uninscribed handle sheet (protective sheet, *page de garde*) was often stitched onto the first inscribed sheet; it is unclear whether in such cases a handle sheet was also attached to the last inscribed sheet (at least in 1QIsa[a] this was not the case). Remnants of an attached initial handle sheet have been preserved only for 4QBarkhi Nafshi[b] (4Q435); in all other instances the evidence is indirect, indicated by stitches at the right edge of the leather of the first inscribed sheet.

The final column of the text was usually ruled beyond the last inscribed line of the composition as far as the end of the column, e. g. 1QpHab, 1QIsa[a], 11QtgJob, 11QPs[a]. Beyond the last inscribed column, the end of the scroll was indicated by one of the following systems: (1) the final column was often followed by an uninscribed surface, either ruled or unruled, that was often as wide as a complete column: 1QpHab; 11QpaleoLev[a]; 11QPs[a]; 11QtgJob; (2) a separate (ruled or unruled) uninscribed handle sheet (protective sheet) was often stitched onto the last inscribed sheet; (3) sometimes both systems were combined. In one case,

[38] See n. 37.

there is evidence for the existence of *wooden bars, rollers* (עמודים) for handling the scrolls: 11QapocrPs (11Q11, ascribed to 50–70 CE).

The main evidence for the indication of titles pertains to nonbiblical scrolls, while there is one doubtful case of the name written on the verso of a biblical scroll, 4QGen$^{h\text{-}title}$ (4Q8c).

When a scroll was torn before or after being inscribed, it was often stitched. *Stitching* sewn prior to the writing in a scroll made it necessary for the scribe to leave open segments in the middle of the text, which were frequently as extensive as two complete lines. Stitching that was executed after the writing necessarily rendered some words illegible (e.g. 4QJer^{c} XXIII). Accordingly, when the stitching appears in the middle of an inscribed area it can usually be determined whether it was done before or after the writing. When the stitching appears in the uninscribed margins, as in most instances, it cannot be determined when the scroll was sewn.

Wear and tear to a scroll in antiquity, in both inscribed and uninscribed areas, was sometimes repaired by sewing a patch onto the scroll. Most such patches were not inscribed (e.g. the back of 11QT^{a} [11Q20] XXIII–XXIV[39] and the front of col. XXVII), while there is some evidence for inscribed patches. The only known inscribed patch from Qumran was once attached to col. VIII of 4QpaleoExod^{m}.[40]

Inscribed (4QpapUnclassified Fragments [4Q51a]) and uninscribed papyrus strips were attached in antiquity to the back of the leather of 4QSam^{a} for support. Likewise, Trever, who was the first to study several scrolls in 1948, writes on 1QS: "A fairly large piece of this white leather (or parchment?) was glued to the back of columns 16 and 17, and another along the top back edge of column 19. The bottom edge had a similar treatment in several places where needed (cols. 3, 4, 7, and 12, where dark brown leather was used; and cols. 47 and 48, where a very light leather was used)."[41]

It is unclear how many words in the texts from the Judean Desert were *re-inked* in antiquity when the ink had become faint. Some examples are listed by Martin, but it is difficult to evaluate their validity.[42] The final column of 1QIsa^{a} was probably damaged in antiquity, possibly since it did not have a handle sheet or an uninscribed section for handling; as a result, the ends of lines 1–4, 6, 7, 9, 10 were re-inked.

At the other end of the spectrum are found several beautiful scrolls that can definitely be designated as *de luxe* editions. Large *de luxe* editions, in scrolls from 50 BCE onwards, were prepared mainly for biblical scrolls, especially of MT. This

[39] Yadin, *Temple Scroll,* pl. 12*.

[40] See *DJD* IX, 84–5 and pl. XI.

[41] J. C. Trever, "Preliminary Observations on the Jerusalem Scrolls," *BASOR* 111 (1948) 3–16 (the quote is from p. 5).

[42] Martin, *Scribal Character*, II.424.

category possibly coincides with the "exact copies" (ἠκριβωμένα) of Scripture that were fostered by the temple circles in Lieberman's description, based on statements in rabbinic sources.[43] The assumption of such *de luxe* editions is based on the following data: (1) Large margins usually accompany texts with a large format. (2) The great majority of the scrolls written in *de luxe* format reflect the medieval text of MT.[44] Since the *de luxe* format was used mainly for the scrolls of the Masoretic family, we assume that many of them were produced in Jerusalem, the spiritual center of Judaism, the same center that subsequently formulated the rules for writing that were transmitted in the Talmud and *Massekhet Soferim*. (3) As a rule, *de luxe* rolls are characterized by a low level of scribal intervention, as may be expected from scrolls that usually were carefully written, and therefore had fewer mistakes that needed correction. However, the exponent of scribal intervention pertains not only to the correction of mistakes, but also to the insertion of scribal changes in the text.

There is no evidence that *large compositions* were written on more than one scroll, except for the books of the Torah. 1QIsa[a] was written by two scribes and their sheets were subsequently sewn together. Hence, the custom of subdividing large compositions into different scrolls probably derives from later times. Thus, while 4QSam[a] contains both 1 and 2 Samuel, later manuscripts divided the book into two segments.

Long texts naturally required longer scrolls, which are recognizable by their length and the height of the columns. It is unclear what the size of the maximum scroll was in the period when the Qumran scrolls were written. At a later period, *b. B. Bat.* 13b makes reference to large scrolls containing all the books of the Torah, Prophets, *or* Writings, and even a scroll containing all of these together ("bound up"), but the Qumran evidence neither supports nor contradicts the existence of such large scrolls. The evidence from the Judean Desert includes possible proof of a complete Torah scroll (Mur 1: Genesis-Exodus and possibly Numbers), as well of some combinations of books of the Torah in six different scrolls: Genesis-Exodus, Exodus-Leviticus, and Leviticus-Numbers.

It is thus likely that several of the scrolls found at Qumran contained more than one book of the Torah, and possibly all of the Torah, in which case they would have measured 25–30 meters. According to *Sof.* 3.4, two of the books of the Torah were not to be combined if there was no intention of adding the other three books to them. If this rule had been followed in the scrolls found at Qumran, every occurrence of two attached books of the Torah must have been part of a longer Torah scroll. However, it is unknown whether this rule was followed in the Judean Desert scrolls.

---

[43] Lieberman, *Hellenism*, 20–27.

[44] For a list, see *Scribal Practices*, 125–9.

Little is known about the *storage* of scrolls. Caves 1 and 3 at Qumran held large numbers of cylindrical jars, several of which were probably used for storing scrolls. These jars may have been sealed with pieces of linen, as suggested by Crowfoot.[45] Although it is not known which scrolls were stored in these jars, the jars in cave 1 probably contained the scrolls that remained fairly well intact, namely, 1QIsa^{a}, 1QM, 1QS, 1QapGen ar, and 1QH^{a}.

Any *damage*, including natural wear and tear incurred by frequent handling, required the discontinuation of the use of scrolls for cult service and their storage in a special area (*genizah*). There is no evidence for such *genizot* at Qumran, but at Masada there is ample evidence for this custom, since a scroll of Deuteronomy and one of Ezekiel were buried under the floor of the synagogue, in two separate *genizot*. Why these specific scrolls were buried there, and not others, remains unknown since only fragments of the scrolls have been preserved. But it stands to reason that these scrolls or segments of them were damaged at an earlier stage, making them unfit for public reading, and therefore religious storage became mandatory. These scrolls were probably buried by the Zealots during their stay at Masada (thus providing us with a *terminus ante quem* for the copying and storage, namely 73 CE). Their burial in separate pits shows that the scrolls were discarded at different times.

5. Special Procedures for Biblical Texts?

In the wake of the rabbinic instructions for the writing of biblical texts, especially those included in the late *Massekhet Soferim* collection, it is usually claimed that sacred writings were copied carefully with specific scribal conventions or, in any event, more carefully than nonsacred literature. However, the corpus of texts from the Judean Desert, when taken as a whole, shows that the scribes made little distinction when copying sacred and nonsacred manuscripts, and more specifically biblical and nonbiblical manuscripts. In some circles a limited or even rigid distinction was made between these two types of manuscripts (see, for example, the regulations in rabbinic literature for the writing of sacred texts). However, this distinction is not reflected in the Judean Desert texts when taken as a whole. At the same time, paleo-Hebrew biblical manuscripts and many proto-Masoretic texts were singled out by certain circles for careful copying.

The Pharisees (and probably also the Sadducees) probably developed special rules for the writing of sacred texts. However, it cannot be said that these circles distinguished between the writing of sacred and nonsacred manuscripts, as they probably did not generate any nonsacred literary writings. When reading the instructions in rabbinic literature regarding the writing of sacred texts, the

[45] G. M. Crowfoot, *DJD* I, 19, 24.

impression is created that these instructions are specific to sacred texts, but from the Qumran texts it is now evident that in most instances identical procedures were also applied to nonsacred texts.

The only differences between the copying of biblical and nonbiblical texts that are visible in the texts from the Judean Desert are:

– Biblical texts from the Judean Desert were almost exclusively written on parchment (thus also the rabbinic prescriptions for the writing of biblical texts in *m. Meg.* 2:2; *y. Meg.* 1.71d).

– Biblical texts were inscribed on only one side of the parchment unlike an undetermined (small) number of nonbiblical opisthographs from the Judean Desert.

– A *de luxe* format was used especially for biblical scrolls.

– A special stichographic layout was devised for the writing of several poetical sections in many biblical scrolls, as well as in one nonbiblical scroll.

In this study, the procedures followed during the last few centuries BCE and the first centuries CE for the copying of biblical scrolls were scrutinized. These procedures involved the various technical preparations made for the copying, a discussion of the identity of the ancient scribes, a detailed discussion of the copying itself, the production of the scroll after the completion of the writing, and a discussion of whether or not the production of biblical scrolls differed from that of nonbiblical scrolls. Continued analysis of these procedures on the basis of the finds from the Judean Desert will further illuminate aspects of the transmission of ancient texts.

Chapter Ten

The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert – An Overview and Analysis

1. Introduction and Statistics

In many ways, the newly discovered texts have revolutionized the study of the text of Hebrew Scripture, as well as that of Greek Scripture. Many aspects of the transmission of the biblical text can now be illustrated by the Judean Desert texts, and occasionally this applies also to the last stages of the literary growth of the biblical books. In the scholarly jargon it may sound a little bombastic to speak of "revolutionizing" the field, but this term probably describes the finds from the Judean Desert correctly, especially the ones from Qumran. Some may claim that the texts found outside Qumran in Wadi Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Ṣe'elim, and Masada are uninteresting, as they "merely" confirm the medieval MT, but these texts, too, are in many ways remarkable.[1] The novel aspects relating to all these texts from the Judean Desert pertain not only to the new data, but also to a better understanding of the sources known prior to the Qumran finds.[2]

---

[1] Information concerning the provenance of the biblical texts is usually rather stable. At the same time, 4QPs[q] may derive from Naḥal Ḥever (see P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and P. W. Flint, *DJD* XVI, 145). The provenance of XLev, XJosh, XJudg, and XMinor Prophets as well as that of all the texts mentioned in n. 7 is equally unclear.

[2] For my own summaries, see: "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *HUCA* 53 (1982) 11–27; "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," *JJS* 39 (1988) 1–37; "The Significance of the Texts from the Judean Desert for the History of the Text of the Hebrew Bible – A New Synthesis," in *Qumran between the Old and the New Testament* (ed. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 277–309; *TCHB,* 100–21. For additional summaries, in chronological order, see: Skehan, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran"; F. García Martínez, "Lista de MSS procedentes de Qumrán," *Henoch* 11 (1989) 149–232; E. C. Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4: An Overview and a Progress Report on Their Publication," *RevQ* 14 (1989–1990) 207–28; A. S. van der Woude, "Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974–1988)," *TRu* 55 (1990) 245–307, esp. 274–307; 57 (1992) 1–57; G. J. Brooke, "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition. Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Merklein et al.; BBB 88; Bonn, 1993) 97–120; E. C. Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in *DSS After Fifty Years*, 1:79–100; idem, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls–The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000) 67–87; idem, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in Schiffman, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 51–9; É. Puech,

The analysis of these texts would have been different had the texts from cave 4 been published prior to or simultaneously with those from cave 1. As it happened, the texts that have been most researched are the ones that became known first, that is, 1QIsa[a] (1951) and subsequently the texts published by Sukenik (Jerusalem 1954)[3] and the ones published in *DJD* I (1955). The only texts from cave 4 that were known in the early 1950s were two columns of 4QSam[a] (1953), one column of 4QSam[b] (1955), and 4QQoh[a] (1954). It is therefore not surprising that in the minds of many scholars, consciously or not, the special characteristics of the large Isaiah scroll were considered to be the norm for the textual nature and scribal features of all the Qumran texts. On the influence of 1QIsa[a] on the research of the other scrolls, see chapter 5*, § 2.

The present survey of the biblical texts covers all the Judean Desert sites, including Qumran, Wadi Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Ṣe'elim, and Masada. The survey includes indirect evidence embedded in nonbiblical Qumran texts.

Now that all the known Hebrew/Aramaic biblical texts from the Judean Desert have been published, we can easily assess their evidence. The biblical texts have been published in several large-size volumes (see the beginning of chapter 16*). These volumes are joined by the editions of 1QIsa[b] by Sukenik,[4] of 1QIsa[a] by Parry-Qimron, *Isaiah*, and of 11QpaleoLev[a] by Freedman-Mathews.[5] The *DJD* edition of the Isaiah scrolls from cave 1 will follow suit (vol. XXXII). The *tefillin* and *mezuzot* were published in various additional editions.[6]

The final count of the biblical scrolls recorded in *DJD* XXXIX amounts to 200–201 fragmentary scrolls from Qumran (representing 205–206 biblical books) of the Hebrew/Aramaic Bible and 23 fragmentary scrolls from other sites in the Judean Desert. The slight fluctuation for Qumran pertains to 4QGen[h1] and 4QGen[h2], which may or may not reflect one scroll according to its editor, J. Davila. But also beyond this scroll many doubts remain in matters of detail. For

---

"Qumrân et le texte de l'Ancien Testament," in *Congress Volume Oslo 1998* (ed. A. Lemaire and M. Saebø; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 2000) 437–64; E. Ulrich, "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran," in *The Bible at Qumran – Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge, U. K.: Eerdmans, 2001) 51–66.

[3] Sukenik, *'wsr hmgylwt hgnwzwt*.

[4] Sukenik, *'wsr hmgylwt hgnwzwt*.

[5] D. N. Freedman and K. A. Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985). Three texts were published elsewhere: 4QGen[n] (*DJD* XXV); 4Qpap cryptA Lev[h] (*DJD* XXXVI); MurGen[(a)] (É. Puech, "Fragment d'un rouleau de la Genèse provenant du Désert de Juda," *RevQ* 10 [1979–1981] 163–6). See further the texts mentioned in n. 7.

[6] *DJD* I, II, III, VI, XXXVIII; Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran* (Jerusalem: IES and the Shrine of the Book, 1969). Since the same sections are contained in both *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, it is hard to distinguish between the two in fragmentary texts (note especially 4QPhyl S and U and 4QMez G), the main criterion for the distinction being their physical features (see J. T. Milik, *DJD* VI, 35–7).

example, do the various fragments of Mur 1 (Genesis, Exodus, Numbers) reflect one, two, or three manuscripts? Further, it is often unclear whether the separation of several groups of fragments into different manuscripts or their combination into one manuscript is correct. Are 4QJer[b,d,e] indeed three manuscripts as was claimed in *DJD* XV, and are the Deuteronomy and Exodus segments of 4QDeut[j] indeed part of the same manuscript as was claimed by J. A. Duncan in *DJD* XIV? As a result of these and similar problems, the totals for the manuscripts of the biblical books are approximate only. After the publication of the list of 200–201 fragmentary scrolls in *DJD* XXXIX, several additional fragmentary texts have been published or have become known.[7]

In the analysis of the biblical texts from the Judean Desert, the definition of the scope of the biblical corpus is unclear since we are uncertain regarding the canonical conceptions of the persons who left these texts behind.[8] Our analysis refers only to the books contained in the traditional canon of the Hebrew/Aramaic Bible.

Although the notion of what exactly constitutes a fragment of a biblical text as opposed to a parabiblical text or *pesher* is sometimes unclear, our figures are based on the views of the scholars publishing these texts. We regard texts that have been given names of the biblical books, such as 1QIsa[a], as being biblical. Phylacteries and *mezuzot*, although containing segments of Hebrew Scripture, are excluded from the statistics, since they are not biblical texts in the usual sense of the word. By the same token, one could exclude other texts that may have served liturgical purposes, such as scrolls containing both biblical Psalms and other Hymnic material, but as these scrolls have been given biblical names, they are included in our statistics. This pertains, for example, to the collections

---

[7] In chronological order: É. Puech, "Un nouveau manuscrit de la Genèse de la grotte 4: *4Q483 = pap4Genèse*," *RevQ* 19 (1999) 259–60; idem, "Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit[b] de l'Ecclesiaste (4QQohelet[b] ou 4Q110)," *RevQ* 19 (2000) 607–16; idem, "Identification de nouveaux manuscrits bibliques: Deutéronome et Proverbes dans les débris de la grotte 4," *RevQ* 20 (2001) 121–7; U. Dahmen, "Neu identifizierte Fragmente in den Deuteronomium-Handschriften vom Toten Meer," *RevQ* 20 (2002) 571–81; É. Puech, "Un autre manuscrit du Levitique," *RevQ* 21 (2003) 275–80; idem, E. Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit des Juges 4Q50a," *RQ* 21 (2003) 315–319; H. Eshel, "A Second Fragment of XJudges," *JJS* 54 (2003) 139–41; E. Eshel and H. Eshel, "New Fragments from Qumran: 4QGen[f], 4QIsa[b], 4Q226, 8QGen, and XQpapEnoch," *DSD* 12 (2005) 134–57; H. Eshel et al., "Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004," *DSD* 13 (2006) 55–60; É. Puech, "Les manuscrits 4QJuges[c] (= 4Q50[A]) et 1QJuges (= 1Q6)," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. P. W. Flint et al; VTSup 101; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2006) 184–202; Y. Baruch and H. Eshel, "Another Fragment of SdeirGenesis," *JJS* 57 (2006) 136–8; E. Eshel, H. Eshel, and M. Broshi, "A New Fragment of XJudges," *DSD* 14 (2007) 407–410. T. Elgvin informs me (February 2007) of additional fragments in the Schøyen collection from the following books: Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Samuel, Joel, Psalms. All these fragments are small and their provenance is unknown (probably Qumran cave 4). All these texts are *not* included in the statistics below.

[8] For a recent analysis, see A. Lange, "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process," in *The Bible as Book*, 21–30.

of texts included in 4QPs^{f}, 11QPs^{a}, and 11QPs^{b} (see below and chapters 4* and 6*). Qumran compositions that contain anthologies of biblical texts (especially 4QTest [4Q175]) are excluded from the statistics, as they do not represent biblical scrolls in the regular sense of the word, but they are analyzed below as evidence for the biblical text (see chapter 4*).

Because of this procedure, the overall number of the biblical scrolls includes different types of biblical texts. Most texts represent regular biblical scrolls, but some biblical texts may represent liturgical texts or abbreviated or excerpted compositions. For all these, see below.[9]

Within the Qumran corpus of some 930 texts, the 200 biblical texts constitute 22 percent (not counting the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*), while in the Masada corpus the biblical texts constitute a larger percentage, 46.6 or 43.75 percent depending on a calculation of either fifteen or sixteen literary texts at Masada. Within the biblical corpus, a special interest in the Torah is visible at all the sites in the Judean Desert: 87 texts or 43.5 percent of the Qumran biblical corpus represent the books of the Torah. At sites other than Qumran this percentage is even greater: fifteen of the twenty-five biblical texts or 62.5 percent represent the Torah.

The number of copies of individual books shows the differing levels of interest in them. The exceptionally large number of copies of Deuteronomy (30), Isaiah (21), and Psalms (36) probably reflects the interest of the Qumran covenanters in these books.

The beginnings, or parts thereof, of a number of texts from Qumran (fifty-one or 5.5 percent of all the preserved scrolls) and the other sites in the Judean Desert (two scrolls) have been preserved, while the ends of a smaller number of scrolls have been preserved (twenty-nine from Qumran [3.1 percent of the total scrolls from that site]) and two from Masada.[10] The extremities of these scrolls are recognizable because of conventions practiced by scribes and scroll manufacturers (uninscribed areas, handle sheets), while often segments of the first or last columns have been preserved. In any event, no differences are recognizable

---

[9] Two aspects remain problematical:

1. Some of the very fragmentary texts which have been named biblical may actually have been part of compositions which included among other things long stretches of Bible texts, such as *pesharim*, other commentaries, or rewritten Bible compositions. For example, the text that has been published as 4QpapIsa^{p} (4Q69) contains only a few words, and could therefore also have represented a *pesher* like 4Qpap pIsa^{c}. By the same token, the list includes a minute fragment inscribed in the cryptic A script, described by Pfann (*DJD* XXXVI) as a fragment of the book of Leviticus: (pap cryptA Lev^{b}?), but more likely it reflects only a quotation from that book. Likewise, the "biblical" 2QExod^{b} may actually contain a rewritten Bible text.

2. The manuscripts of 4QReworked Pentateuch$^{a–e}$ (4Q158, 4Q364–367) have been published as nonbiblical texts in *DJD* V and XIII, but need to be reclassified as biblical manuscripts. These texts would add four additional biblical manuscripts to the list. See the end of chapter 10* and my study "The Many Forms." See also § 4Bc ε below.

[10] See *Scribal Practices*, 108–18. See further chapter 9* § 4 regarding the special status of the texts from cave 11.

between the biblical and nonbiblical scrolls with regard to the practices used at the beginnings and ends of scrolls. Some have large uninscribed areas at the beginning or end, while others have handle sheets at one of the extremities, while rarely these two conventions were used at the same time.

2. External Data on the Biblical Scrolls

1QIsa[a] is the only scroll that has been preserved in its entirety, 54 columns in 17 sheets. Substantial remains have been preserved of 1QIsa[b], 4QpaleoExod[m], 4QNum[b], 4QSam[a], 4QIsa[c], 4QJer[a], 11QpaleoLev[a], 11QPs[a], MurXII, and 11QtgJob, while the preserved remains of all other scrolls are fragmentary, even very fragmentary. Sometimes a tiny inscribed piece is the only evidence for a biblical scroll identified by its content, and/or script.

If two or more biblical books were contained in a single scroll, these books were part of a larger unit. However, evidence for scrolls containing such a large unit is scanty, while there is evidence for single books within those larger units that were demonstrably *not* part of such larger units. Of course, scrolls starting with Genesis (4QGen[b,g,k]), Joshua (XJosh), Kings (5QKgs), Isaiah (1QIsa[a] and MurIsa), or the Minor Prophets (4QXII[d]) preceded by a handle sheet or a large uninscribed area should cause no surprise. Nor should it be surprising that MasDeut, MasPs[b], and 11QPs[a] ended with a final handle sheet or an uninscribed surface. At the same time, there is some evidence for scrolls that contain a single biblical book and are not part of a larger unit.

Thus the inclusion in one scroll of more than one biblical book is evidenced for 4, 5, or 6 Torah scrolls: 4QGen-Exod[a] (36 lines; evidence unclear), 4QpaleoGen-Exod[l] (55–60 lines), 4QExod[b] (= 4Q[Gen-]Exod[b]; *c.* 50 lines), and possibly also 4QExod-Lev[f] (*c.* 60 lines), 4QLev-Num[a] (43 lines), and Mur 1 (*c.* 60 lines), the latter possibly containing Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers (see *DJD* II, 75–8). In all these cases, the spaces between the two books have been preserved together with some letters or words of the adjacent book, but in no instance has the full evidence been preserved. The large column size of several of these scrolls confirms the assumption that they indeed contained two or more books, since a large number of lines per column usually implies that the scroll was long. On the basis of the large parameters of these scrolls, it may be presumed that other Torah scrolls likewise contained two or more books: 4QGen[e] (*c.* 50 lines), 4QExod[e] (*c.* 43), MasDeut (42), SdeirGen (*c.* 40), 4QGen[b] (40). On the length of the Torah scrolls, see chapter 9* § 4.

The books of the Minor Prophets were included in one scroll in MurXII, 4QXII[b] and 4QXII[g]: a space of three lines was left between various books in MurXII, as evidenced by the transitions Jonah/Micah, Micah/Nahum, and Zephaniah/Haggai (see *DJD* III, 182, 192, 197, 200, 202, 205). This practice follows the tradition,

also known from *b. B. Bat.* 13b, for combining these books as one unit, while in 4QXII[b] frg. 3 5 only one line is left between Zephaniah and Haggai and in 4QXII[g] frgs. 70–75 one-and-a-half lines were left between Amos and Obadiah.

While most of the Qumran copies of the Five Scrolls were probably contained in separate scrolls (note their small dimensions), there may be indirect evidence for one scroll containing all five *Megillot* or at least one additional book beyond Lamentations. The first preserved column of 4QLam starts at the top with Lam 1:1b היתה כאלמנה רבתי בגוים שרתי במדינות היתה למס, and since the column length of the scroll is known (10–11 lines), the preceding column would have contained at least the first line of the book, a few empty lines, and the end of the book preceding Lamentations.

At the same time, there is some evidence for scrolls that contain a single biblical book and are not part of a larger unit: 11QpaleoLev[a], 4QLev[c], 4QDeut[h], 6QDeut? (6Q20), 1QIsa[a], and most extant Qumran copies of the Five Scrolls.[11]

Some general conclusions on the scope of the biblical scrolls written in leather scrolls can be formulated, although many details remain uncertain, especially since some biblical scrolls probably contained only selections.

Torah: The average scroll of a single book of the Torah probably contained 20–30 lines per column. Scrolls of a smaller size would not have contained the complete books, and the longer ones (40–60 lines) could have contained two or more books. Thus in Genesis five long copies (4QGen[b,e], SdeirGen, MurGen-Num, 4QExod[b] [= 4Q[Gen-] Exod[b]]) contain 40–50 lines, while the smaller ones, 4QGen[d,g,f], contain 11, 14, and 17 lines. Medium-length copies contain 24 and 25 lines. 4QGen[d], with merely 11 lines and 4QExod[e] with 8 lines definitely did not contain the complete books. Likewise, 4QDeut[j,n] probably contained liturgical excerpts.

Major Prophets: Average copies of a single scroll contained 30–40 lines in the cases of Isaiah and Ezekiel and 20–30 lines in the case of Jeremiah. 4QEzek[b] with 11 lines is an exception, and according to J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* XV, 216 it is unlikely that this scroll contained the entire text of Ezekiel as it would have been an improbable 32 meters long with 280 columns. A single scroll of Isaiah is also mentioned in Luke 4:16–21.[12]

Psalms: The smaller scrolls were of a limited size, containing only Psalm 119 (1QPs[a], 4QPs[g], 4QPs[h], 5QPs [for the latter two and 1QPs[a], no measurements can be made]), Psalm 104 (4QPs[l]), or a small anthology of psalms, while the longer ones contained all or most biblical Psalms. At the same time, we lack specific data on the contents of many of the Psalms scrolls that are known in a variety of sizes, from 8 to 60+ lines.

---

[11] For details, see *Scribal Practices*, 79.

[12] Prior to reading, Jesus unrolled this scroll and then rerolled it (πτύσσω and ἀναπτύσσω in vv 17 and 20) once he had finished.

Five Scrolls: All known copies of the Five Scrolls (with the exception of 4QQoh[a]) are small. With the exception of 4QLam, which probably was preceded by another book, probably all preserved specimens of the Five Scrolls contained a single book only.

Daniel: 4QDan[a,b,c] contained 16–22 lines, while 4QDan[e] was smaller (9 lines). According to E. Ulrich, *DJD* XVI, 287, the latter scroll probably contained only a segment of the book, as 120 columns would have been needed to contain the complete book.

3. Scribal Features

The data known regarding the Qumran texts show that sacred and nonsacred literary texts share all the main scribal features relating to writing, horizontal and vertical ruling, stitching of sheets, size and shape of columns, correction systems, scribal signs, length of scrolls, number of columns per sheet, height of columns, margins, paragraphing, repair-stitching, patching, initial and final handle sheets, and use of guide dots/strokes. Although further research is required, the leather used for biblical texts was seemingly not of a superior quality to that used for nonbiblical compositions.

As with the nonbiblical scrolls, the Hebrew biblical scrolls from Qumran show no evidence of verse division as in the later MT.

All the sub-systems used for paragraphing are shared by biblical and nonbiblical manuscripts, relating to small and large spaces within the line and at the end of the line, completely empty lines, and indentations. At the same time, the *paragraphos* signs are rarely used in biblical texts.

Poor tanning, scar tissue, and stitching forced scribes to leave certain areas uninscribed in both types of scrolls. Inscribed (4QUnclassified frags. [4Q51a]) and uninscribed papyrus strips were attached in antiquity to the back of the leather of 4QSam[a] for support. It is unclear how many words in the Judean Desert texts were re-inked in antiquity when the ink had become faint.

Use of scribal marks in biblical scrolls was more limited than in nonbiblical scrolls, but the data do not suffice for drawing a distinction between the two types of texts. For a detailed analysis, see *Scribal Practices*, 178–218.

Only a few distinctions between biblical and nonbiblical literary manuscripts are visible. For a detailed analysis, see chapter 9*, § 5 and *Scribal Practices*, 252.

This summary shows that the rules for the writing of sacred texts recorded in *Massekhet Soferim* and in earlier rabbinic sources are somewhat misleading when detached from the writing of nonsacred texts, since most details recorded there pertain to writing practices employed in an identical way in nonsacred texts during the Second Temple period. For example, *Sof.* 1.15 states that texts that deviate from the norm regarding the indication of open and closed sections cannot be

used as sacred writings. However, this practice, which is basically a paragraphing system, was followed in most compositions written in the Qumran period, biblical and nonbiblical. Thus, the practice itself was not sacred, but rather the tradition of indicating a specific type of paragraphing in a given instance. Likewise, the practice of leaving larger bottom margins than top margins in manuscripts (*Sof.* 2.5; *y. Meg.* 1.71d) was the norm in most texts, and not only in Torah scrolls. In other cases, criteria were instituted for regulating precision when copying scrolls, but these criteria were also in vogue for any well-written scroll from the Judean Desert; in the case of sacred scrolls, these criteria were formulated in such a way that the scrolls could not be used if they fell below a certain standard of precision: a scroll of Scripture in which a complete line was erased (*Sof.* 3.9), scrolls containing more than a certain number of mistakes (3.10), scrolls with mixed medial and final letters (2.20), or scrolls displaying letters written beyond the vertical left-hand margin (2.3) could not be used for sacred purposes.

Large *de luxe* editions, especially of MT, and especially in scrolls from later periods, seem to be specific to biblical scrolls, see *Scribal Practices*, 125–9. *De luxe* rolls are characterized by wide top and bottom margins, a large writing block, adherence to the medieval text of MT, and a limited amount of scribal intervention. It is not impossible that these scrolls are the corrected copies mentioned in *b. Pes.* 112a: "when you teach your son, teach him from a corrected copy (ספר מוגה)."

4. Textual Character

A. Sites Other Than Qumran

All the twenty-three texts found outside Qumran reflect the medieval consonantal text of MT, more so than the proto-Masoretic Qumran texts. This grouping comprises the following sites and texts: Masada (Genesis, Leviticus [2], Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Psalms [2]),[13] Wadi Sdeir (Genesis), Naḥal Ṣe'elim (Numbers), Naḥal Ḥever (Numbers [2], Deuteronomy, Psalms) and Murabba'at (Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Minor Prophets).[14] See also the texts from three unknown sites: XJosh, XJudg, and XBiblical Text?.[15] The only differences with the medieval text pertain to orthography, a few minute variants, paragraphing, and the layout of individual Psalms. All these variations resemble the internal differences between the medieval manuscripts of MT themselves.[16]

[13] For the publication and an analysis, see Talmon, *Masada VI*. For subsequent analyses, see E. Tov, "A Qumran Origin for the Masada Nonbiblical Texts?" *DSD* 7 (2000) 57–73; E. Ulrich, "Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts from Masada," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 543–64.

[14] For the first three sites, see the texts published by P. W. Flint, M. Morgenstern, and C. Murphy in *DJD* XXXVIII. For the last site, see the texts published by J. T. Milik in *DJD* II.

[15] The texts were published in *DJD* XXVIII and XXXVIII.

[16] See, further, chapter 12*. For detailed statistics and an analysis, see I. Young, "The Stabi-

B. Qumran

The main sources for our knowledge of the biblical text at Qumran are those containing a running biblical text, but our information is supplemented by other sources of limited value, viz., quotations in the nonbiblical compositions as well as excerpted and abbreviated biblical manuscripts.[17]

a. The Biblical Text Reflected in the Nonbiblical Compositions

A full analysis of the biblical text at Qumran ought to include the quotations from the Bible in the nonbiblical documents, which add to our knowledge of the variety of biblical texts in the period under investigation. The perusal of these nonbiblical texts is complicated, since it is often difficult to extract from them reliable information about the biblical text quoted. These difficulties are caused by the fact that biblical quotations are found in a variety of compositions, each of which requires a different type of analysis. Thus the evaluation of the textual deviations reflected in the biblical quotations in these compositions differs not only from one category of compositions to the other, but also from one composition to the next:[18]

α. *Quotations and Allusions in Nonbiblical Compositions*. Several nonbiblical compositions, both sectarian and non-sectarian, freely quote from and allude to passages in the Bible. Indeed, the sectarian *Hodayot* and *Rules*, as well as non-Qumranic compositions such as 4QNon-Canonical Psalms A–B (4Q380–81) abound with biblical quotations. Most of these quotations are free, involving changes in the biblical text, which accordingly cannot be utilized easily within the context of a text-critical discussion. The textual background of some compositions has been studied, but few solid conclusions have been reached.[19] We agree

lization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?" *DSD* 9 (2002) 364–90. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle 3*, cxiii considers MurXII a characteristic sample of the textual standardization which took place between the two revolts and which is therefore more properly proto-Masoretic, so to speak, than the earlier Qumran texts of the Minor Prophets and of other books.

[17] Greenstein suggested that when encountering variations in the biblical and nonbiblical texts, one's first inclination should be to assume the scribe's faulty memory: E. L. Greenstein, "Misquotation of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume* (ed. B. Walfish; Haifa: Haifa University Press, 1993) 71–83. A similar theory had been advanced previously for 1QIsa[a] by H. M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll," *JBL* 69 (1950) 149–66 (165). In our view, this approach would be valid in only a few instances.

[18] Excerpted and abbreviated biblical manuscripts are analyzed below as a subgroup of biblical manuscripts.

[19] M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Bible Quotations in the Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls," *VT* 3 (1953) 79–82; J. Carmignac, "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans 'La Guerre des Fils de la Lumière contre Les Fils des Ténèbres'," *RB* 63 (1956) 234–61, 375–91; M. Mansoor, "The Thanksgiving Hymns and the Masoretic Text (II)," *RevQ* 3 (1961) 387–94; J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (STDJ 4; Leiden:

with Lange's conclusion that no specific text group (in his words, "text type") is preferred in the biblical quotations in the nonbiblical Qumran compositions.[20]

β. Pesharim *and Other Commentaries*. *Pesharim* are composed of quotations from the biblical text (lemmas) and their exposition (*pesher*). These lemmas in the eighteen running *pesharim* on biblical books or parts of them from caves 1 and 4 contain long stretches of biblical text, which, when combined, would amount to running biblical manuscripts, were it not that they often have been preserved only fragmentarily. However, in 1QpHab, 4QpNah, 4QpPs, and some *pesharim* on Isaiah, such running texts may be reconstructed. In addition, the exposition in the *pesher* itself sometimes also reflects a few additional readings differing from the biblical text on which the *pesher* comments.

Different views have been voiced regarding the text-critical value of the biblical text contained in and reflected by these *pesharim*. A positive position was taken by the editors of textual editions that incorporated readings from these *pesharim* (mainly from the lemmas) in their textual apparatuses (*BHS* for 1QpHab, *HUBP* for the *pesharim* on Isaiah, and *Biblia Qumranica* for the Minor Prophets; see chapter 16*). Some scholars cautioned that many so-called deviations from MT in the *pesharim* and commentaries[21] were due to contextual exegesis. However, although such exegesis is found in the *pesharim,* including a few cases of sectarian exegesis,[22] many, if not most, deviations in the lemmas probably reflect variants found in the biblical manuscripts used by the commentator.[23] The Qumran

---

E. J. Brill, 1965); G. Vermes, "Biblical Proof Texts in Qumran Literature," *JSS* 34 (1989) 493–508; J. G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (BZAW 228; Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1995); J. Elwolde, "Distinguishing the Linguistic and the Exegetical: The Biblical Book of Numbers in the Damascus Document," *DSD* 7 (2000) 1–25; M. Riska, *The Temple Scroll and the Biblical Traditions – A Study of Columns 1–13:9* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 81; Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2001); S. Metso, "Biblical Quotations in the Community Rule," in *The Bible as Book,* 81–92; E. Tigchelaar, "The Cave 4 Damascus Document Manuscripts and the Text of the Bible," ibid., 93–111; J. Høgenhaven, "Biblical Quotations and Allusions in 4QApocryphal Lamentations (4Q179)," ibid., 113–20.

[20] A. Lange, "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process," in *The Bible as Book*, 21–30 (27).

[21] E. g., G. Molin, "Der Habakkukkommentar von 'En Feṣḥa in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft," *TZ* 8 (1952) 340–57; G. J. Brooke, "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?" in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (ed. C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 85–100 with references to earlier studies; idem, "Some Remarks on 4Q252 and the Text of Genesis," *Textus* 19 (1998) 1–25.

[22] The most clear-cut examples are 1QpHab VIII 3 (Hab 2:5) הון (MT: היין); 1QpHab XI 3 (Hab 2:15) מועדיהן (MT: מעוריהן). For an analysis, see W. H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (JBL Monograph Series XI; Philadelphia, 1959) 113–8.

[23] L. Novakovic *apud* J. H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History – Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge, U. K.: Eerdmans, 2002) 129–58 lists all the variants that according to her are reflected in the "pesharim, other commentaries, and related documents." See also I. Goldberg, "Variant Readings in the Pesher Habakkuk," *Textus* 17

commentaries probably reflect fewer variants than the *pesharim*.[24] At the same time, it remains difficult to determine the level of manuscript variation. A maximalistic approach underlies the lists of presumed variant readings for 1QpHab by Brownlee (see n. 21) and for all the *pesharim* by Lim.[25] Thus, according to Lim,[26] 17 percent of all the words of the MT of Nahum differ from the corresponding preserved segments of 4QpNah. The number of 4QpNah readings that, according to Lim, differ from MT is substantial, but they include morphological variations and a large number of contextual changes, both of which cannot be evaluated easily. If, according to a minimalist approach, these elements were inserted by the authors of the *pesharim*, the underlying biblical text was probably not very different from MT. On the other hand, if this *Vorlage* already included the morphological variations and contextual changes, it resembled 1QIsa[a] and similar texts. Believing this to be the case, several scholars[27] characterized the underlying texts of the *pesharim* as "vulgar" texts.[28]

The *pesharim* from caves 1 and 4 at Qumran often differ from the Masoretic tradition regarding the scope of the units in the biblical text quoted in the lemmas. Thus, while the lemmas quoting the biblical text in 1QpHab sometimes conform to what is now a verse in the Masoretic tradition of Habakkuk, more frequently they comprise half-verses or even smaller segments. For details, see *Scribal Practices,* Appendix 7.

(1994) ט-כד (Heb.); G. J. Brooke, "Isaiah in the Pesharim and Other Qumran Texts," in *Writing & Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. C. C. Broyles and C. A. Evans; VTSup 70, 1–2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997) 609–32; idem, "The Qumran Pesharim and the Text of Isaiah in the Cave 4 Manuscripts," in *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman* (ed. A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenberg; JSOTSup 333; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 304–20.

[24] In the words of Brooke, "The Biblical Texts," 87 (see n. 21) "… that in more cases than are usually recognized the variants in the biblical texts in the Qumran commentaries have been deliberately caused by the desire of the Qumran commentator to make this text conform with his exegetical understanding."

[25] T. H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Texts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), chapter IV; idem, "Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible–Methodological Considerations," *The Bible as Book,* 71–9.

[26] Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 90.

[27] J. van der Ploeg, "Le rouleau d'Habacuc de la grotte de ʿAin Feshḥa," *BO* 8 (1951) 2–11, esp. 4; K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (BHT 15, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1953) 48; P. Kahle in a review of Elliger in *TLZ* 79 (1954) 478–9; S. Segert, "Zur Habakuk-Rolle aus dem Funde vom Toten Meer VI," *ArOr* 23 (1955) 575–619 (608). These scholars probably go too far when describing the biblical quotations in the *pesharim* as reflecting a distinct textual recension deviating from the other textual sources. A similar conclusion was reached by M. Collin, mainly on the basis of an analysis of 1QpMic, which was characterized by him as reflecting a third recension of the biblical book, alongside the MT and LXX: "Recherches sur l'histoire textuelle du prophète Michée," *VT* 21 (1971) 281–97. This characterization was rejected by L. A. Sinclair, "Hebrew Texts of the Qumran Micah Pesher and Textual Traditions of the Minor Prophets," *RevQ* 11 (1983) 253–63.

[28] For a discussion of what many scholars name "vulgar texts", see *TCHB,* 193–7.

γ. *Rewritten Bible Compositions*. A group of rewritten Bible compositions, including compositions whose names contain the elements "Ps(eudo)" and "Apocr," provides substantial information relevant to our knowledge of the biblical text.[29] These rewritten Bible compositions reformulate the content of Hebrew Scripture, adding and omitting minor and major details, as well as changing many a word. Each composition was a unicum, inserting a different number of changes in the biblical text. Some compositions were very close to the Scripture text, such as the Temple Scroll, which contains long stretches that run parallel to the biblical text, especially in cols. LI–LXVI[30]. At the same time, because of the difficulty in distinguishing between the biblical text and the more substantial added layer of exegesis and rewriting in these compositions, it would be hard to incorporate their deviations from MT in a text-critical analysis.

Although the amount of information on the biblical text reflected in the nonbiblical compositions from Qumran is limited, these sources need to be further explored for textcritical purposes. Among other things, an attempt should be made to examine possible links between the biblical quotations in the nonbiblical Qumran texts, especially the sectarian ones, and the biblical texts found at Qumran. Characteristic readings of the biblical texts need to be isolated in the quotations, and this is possible only when the differences between the manuscripts themselves are sufficiently distinctive. For example, in Isaiah the differences between 1QIsa^{a} (sometimes agreeing with 4QIsa^{c}) on the one hand and on the other hand the proto-Masoretic 1QIsa^{b} and most of the Isaiah manuscripts from cave 4 are quite distinct, as are the differences in Jeremiah between (1) 4QJer^{b,d} and the LXX on the one hand, (2) and the Masoretic 4QJer^{a,c}, and (3) the idiosyncratic 2QJer. At the same time, it remains difficult to determine close affinities between brief quotations from these two books in nonbiblical compositions and specific Qumran biblical manuscripts. A few special links between such quotations and Qumran manuscripts have been noticed, but research of this type is still insufficiently developed.[31]

---

[29] See J.C. VanderKam, "The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works," *The Bible as Book*, 41–56.

[30] That composition does not show a close textual relation to any of the known textual witnesses of the Bible, and its text should probably be characterized as reflecting an independent textual tradition. See the present author in "The Temple Scroll and Old Testament Textual Criticism," *ErIsr* 16 (Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem, 1982) 100–11.

[31] See the discussion of the quotation from Deut 33:8–11 in 4QTest below. See further the examples listed by Tov, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," 34. G. Vermes, "Biblical Proof Texts" mentions a few cases of difference between MT and the text quoted in Qumran compositions, e.g. 1QS V 17 לכן agreeing with MT Isa 2:22 and differing from לכמה in 1QIsa^{a}.

b. Biblical Manuscripts

α. *Excerpted and Abbreviated Texts*. Due to the fragmentary nature of excerpted biblical texts,[32] their essence is not always clear, nor is the background of the excerpting. Most excerpted texts were probably made for liturgical purposes: all the *tefillin*, several manuscripts of Exodus and Deuteronomy, and a long list of Psalm texts from caves 4 and 11 as well as texts from other books and 4QTestimonia (4Q175). Other manuscripts of Exodus, Canticles, Deuteronomy, etc. contain an abbreviated text (see chapter 4*). If the characterization of these scrolls as excerpted and abbreviated texts is correct, their major omissions and transpositions should be disregarded in the textcritical analysis, but other deviations from MT should be taken into consideration, for example in the case of the *tefillin*.[33] The textual character of some excerpted texts is clearly recognizable. Thus, the harmonizing readings of 4QDeut^{n} are conspicuous.[34] Likewise, while the first biblical quotation in 4QTest is close to SP,[35] the third one, from Deut 33:8–11, is very close to 4QDeut^{h}, and may have been based on that scroll or a similar one.[36] These two quotations show that the author of 4QTest quoted from at least two biblical scrolls of a different character, one of the pre-Samaritan texts and 4QDeut^{h}, a textually independent text. This unintentional mixture must have resulted from the author's use of these particular scrolls, and probably neither he nor the other authors took notice of the different textual character of the scrolls consulted.

Another feature of the excerpted and abbreviated texts is that none of these texts, with the exception of the non-Qumranic *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, is close to MT (see chapter 4*). This feature indicates a certain milieu for these anthologies, whose purpose differed from that of the writing of regular Scripture texts.

β. *Regular Biblical Texts*

(1) *Background*. The great majority of the 200 Hebrew biblical texts comes from cave 4, while smaller quantities were found in caves 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 11.[37] How

---

[32] See chapter 4*.

[33] See D. Nakman, "The Contents and Order of the Biblical Sections in the *Tefillin* from Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah: Similarity, Difference, and Some Historical Conclusions," *Cathedra* 112 (2004) 19–44 (Heb.); D. Rothstein, *From Bible to Murabba'at: Studies in the Literary, Scribal and Textual Features of Phylacteries and Mezuzot in Ancient Israel and Early Judaism,* unpubl. Ph.D. diss., University of California, 1992.

[34] See chapter 4*, n. 26.

[35] See chapter 4*, n. 14.

[36] See E. Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in *Manchester Symposium,* 11–47, esp. 31–5; J. A. Duncan, "New Readings for the 'Blessing of Moses' from Qumran," *JBL* 114 (1995) 273–90.

[37] Over the years, the number of the biblical texts has changed reflecting new insights gained into the nature of the fragments, in particular due to the separation of groups of fragments. Thus, P. W. Skehan listed 172 different scrolls in 1965: "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament," *BA* 28 (1965) 87–100. Subsequently, the first edition of Tov–Pfann,

uncertain we are regarding the number of texts originally deposited in the caves is shown by the 68 reinforcing leather tabs found in cave 8.[38] Each reinforcing tab was probably attached to a single scroll, and although this cave probably contained a leather workshop or depository, it is not impossible that many scrolls decayed in this cave and that the reinforcing tabs evidence the existence at one time of many scrolls, much more than the remains of four manuscripts would indicate.

The main depository of texts is cave 4, which contains copies of all the books of the Hebrew Bible, with the exception of Esther.[39] It is significant that virtually all the so-called canonical books were represented in this cave, which probably implies that an effort was made to collect at Qumran all the books which were considered authoritative at that stage, at least in certain Jewish circles, and which became authoritative at a later stage for all of Judaism. On the other hand, only a few books of the Apocrypha, and the so-called Pseudepigrapha, were represented in cave 4 (Tobit, Jubilees, Levi ar, TJud ar, TNaph). Cave 4 probably served as a central depository for the written material owned by the Qumran community, including some *tefillin*, *mezuzot*, and Greek texts. It is probably not coincidental that most Qumran copies of the biblical books which are considered to be significant for the textual analysis of the Hebrew Bible were found in cave 4. While a text like 1QIsa^{a} may be important to our understanding of the textual transmission of the Bible, it contains so many secondary features that its importance for the reconstruction of the original text of Hebrew Scripture is limited.

(2) *Texts in the Paleo-Hebrew Script*. The great majority of the texts from Qumran and the other sites in the Judean Desert are written in the square script,[40] and they reflect a textual variety. A similar variety, though on a smaller scale, is reflected in the texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script, so that the textual character of these texts cannot serve as a key for unscrambling the riddle of the writing in this script. The twelve biblical texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script differ from the texts written in the square script with regard to the scribal characteristics inherent with the writing in that script, with regard to the almost complete lack of scribal intervention in them, and in additional scribal features.[41]

At Qumran, fragments of twelve biblical texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script have been found as well as a few paleo-Hebrew texts of uncertain na-

---

Companion Volume (1993) listed 189 biblical texts, while the second edition added four items. The contents of the different fragments of biblical texts have been listed by Ulrich, *DJD* XXXIX, 185–201.

[38] See J. Carswell, "Fastenings on the Qumran Manuscripts," *DJD* VI, 23–8 (24).

[39] The absence of this book should probably be ascribed to coincidence (decaying of the material) rather than to any other factor.

[40] According to S. Pfann, one of the minute fragments inscribed in the cryptic A script contained a copy of the book of Leviticus: pap cryptA Lev^{h} (*DJD* XXXVI), but more likely it reflects a quote from that book.

[41] See *Scribal Practices*, 246–8.

ture:[42] 1QpaleoLev, 1QpaleoNum (same scroll as 1QpaleoLev?); 2QpaleoLev; 4QpaleoGen-Exod^{l}, 4QpaleoGen^{m}, 4QpaleoExod^{m}, 4QpaleoDeut^{r,s}, 4QpaleoJob^{c}; 6QpaleoGen, 6QpaleoLev; 11QpaleoLev^{a}. Three texts (4Q124–125; 11Q22) are unidentified. 4QpaleoParaJosh, probably not a biblical text, contains parts of Joshua 21. Beyond Qumran, two nonbiblical texts, Mas 1o (Mas pap paleoText of Sam. Origin [recto] and Mas pap paleoUnidentified Text [verso]) are also written in paleo-Hebrew characters.[43]

The writing in the paleo-Hebrew script must have been preserved for the most ancient biblical books, the Torah and Job – note that the latter is traditionally ascribed to Moses (cf. *b. B. Bat.* 14b–15a; cf. also manuscripts and editions of the Peshitta in which Job follows the Torah). Note also that only for one of the books of the Torah (Leviticus) and Job Targumim were found at Qumran. The longest preserved texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script are 4QpaleoExod^{m} and 11QpaleoLev^{a}.

These texts, rather than preceding writing in the square script, were actually written at a relatively late period, probably as a natural continuation of the tradition of writing in the "early" Hebrew script, and were concurrent with the use of the square script. This can be demonstrated by a paleographical examination of the paleo-Hebrew script,[44] and of their orthography which is *not* more archaic than that of the texts written in the square script. While it is tacitly assumed by most scholars that with the revival of the paleo-Hebrew script in the Hasmonean period, texts were transformed from the square to the paleo-Hebrew script,[45] it would be more natural to assume that the habit of writing in the paleo-Hebrew script had never ceased through the centuries. Possibly the paleo-Hebrew texts from Qumran derived from the circles of the Sadducees; the major argument for this assumption is the fact that most paleo-Hebrew texts reflect MT,[46] although writing in this script was forbidden by the Pharisees.[47] One of the special characteristics of the paleo-Hebrew texts is that they display virtually no scribal intervention. It is possible that the Qumran scribes were influenced by this Sadducean tradition when writing the Tetragrammaton and other divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters in biblical and nonbiblical texts, in order that these

[42] See M.D. McLean, *The Use and Development of Palaeo-Hebrew in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods,* Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1982, 41–7 (University Microfilms); P.W. Skehan and E. Ulrich, *DJD* IX.

[43] S. Talmon, *Masada VI*, 138–47.

[44] See R.S. Hanson, "Paleo-Hebrew Scripts in the Hasmonean Age," *BASOR* 175 (1964) 26–42.

[45] Thus K.A. Mathews: "The Background of the Paleo-Hebrew Texts at Qumran," in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth, Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor; Winona Lake, Ind., 1983) 549–68.

[46] See *Scribal Practices,* Appendix 8.

[47] See *m. Yad.* 4.5; *b. Sanh.* 21b; cf. *b. Meg.* 9a; *t. Sanh.* 5.7; *y. Meg.* 1.71b–c. For details, see *Scribal Practices,* 246–8.

words, whose sanctity was determined by the writing in this script, would not be erased. For the analysis of the biblical texts the idiosyncrasy of these texts indicates that not only the contents, but also the external features of the texts need to be taken into consideration.

(3) *Textual Variety.* In view of the differences between the MT, LXX, and SP known before the discoveries in the Judean Desert textual variety among these documents was expected. The description of the Qumran manuscripts as reflecting textual variety is now an established assumption among scholars.[48] It is probably an equally accepted assumption of many scholars that these texts derived from different places in ancient Israel, not only from Qumran. Presently scholars are not as naive as the first generation of Qumran scholars who ascribed all the texts found at Qumran to the Qumran community, while some of them even tried to locate in them the characteristic ideas of that community (see n. 56). At the same time, we do not have to go as far as Golb, who denied any connection between the scrolls found in the caves and the Qumran community living in Khirbet Qumran very close to cave 4.[49] We prefer a middle course according to which some of the Qumran texts (probably not more than thirty percent) were copied by the scribes of the Qumran community, while the remainder were brought to Qumran from outside. We believe that there are criteria in the realm of orthography, morphology, and scribal practices for distinguishing between the two groups (below, α). In that case, it is justifiable to look for sectarian readings, for example, in 1QIsa[a] (although I have not been able to locate them),[50] but it is not justifiable to look for them in any text whose connection with the Qumranites has not been established, such as 4QSam[a], for example.

c. Classification of the Texts According to Textual Character

The classification of the Qumran texts remains a difficult assignment. Preferably the Qumran biblical texts should be classified according to objective criteria, but there hardly is such a criterion.[51] For one thing, the contents of each of the caves

---

[48] For recent discussions, see E. Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in Trebolle*, Madrid Qumran Congress,* 1:23–41; idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls."

[49] N. Golb, "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *APSP* 124 (1980) 1–24; idem, "Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *BA* 48 (1985) 68–82; idem, "Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscripts of the Judaean Wilderness – Observations on the Logic of Their Investigation," *JNES* 49 (1990) 103–14; idem, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls – The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1994).

[50] See note 56.

[51] Note, however, the attempt by I. Young to record the variants by objective criteria: "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Masoretic Text," in *Feasts and Fasts, A Festschrift in Honour of Alan David Crown* (ed. M. Dacy et al.; Mandelbaum Studies in Judaica 11; Sydney: University of Sydney, 2005) 81–139. Young calculated the number of variants (deviations from MT) relative to the number of words in the scrolls excluding orthographic variants, but not differentiating between small insignificant details and major content variations.

are not homogeneous, with the exception of caves 7 and 11.[52] The texts should not be classified by date, or by palaeographical or codicological criteria, since none of these criteria is firm. Probably the best criterion for classification is according to textual character, even though this criterion is problematic as well. But since one of our main interests is gaining insights into the textual nature of the individual texts and the collection as a whole, we nevertheless have to attempt to classify the texts according to this criterion. The first step in this classification is an attempt to determine the principles for describing five textual groups, and to fill in the details for each group. The second step is to see how these groups are distributed in the individual books of the Bible even though we should not forget that the preservation of the Qumran fragments depends to a large degree on coincidence. But even with these limitations it is relevant to examine, for example, how many texts belonging to the proto-Masoretic family have been preserved in each of the books of the Bible, and whether the various biblical books present a different textual picture (below, § d).

The principle behind this classification is the recognition that all texts can be grouped according to the degree of closeness to the MT, LXX, or SP without accepting the claim that these three texts are the central pillars (recensions, texts, text-types, etc.) of the biblical text. One of the groups in this corpus consists of texts which are not close to any of these three entities (group ε below). It may be unusual to classify ancient texts according to the degree of their closeness to later textual witnesses, certainly if these are medieval (MT and SP), but this comparison is necessary, since the base forms of these texts already existed in the last centuries before the turn of the era.

This classification can only be approximate, not only because the texts are fragmentary (very fragmentary texts are not included in the analysis), but also because in the stretches covered by several fragmentary texts there is insufficient opposition between MT and SP in the Torah and MT and the LXX in Isaiah and Ruth. The recognition of this aspect, as well as the coverage of all the Judean Desert texts allow us to correct statistics published earlier.[53]

In the calculation of the percentages for the various groups of texts, the numbers are based on a list of 128 biblical texts (the remaining texts are too fragmentary for textual analysis). In this calculation, the following principles are employed: (1) Questionable attributions to textual groups are counted as regular ones. (2) In accord with statistical probability, texts that are equally close to MT and SP in the Torah and to MT and the LXX in the other books are counted as MT. (3) Texts written according to the Qumran scribal practice (group α) are not included separately in the statistics, since these texts are counted in other groups in accord with their textual affiliation. (4) Texts that are characterized as

[52] See chapter 28*, n. 2.
[53] *TCHB,* 114–6.

both "non-aligned" and close to the LXX or SP are counted as "non-aligned." (5) Since the texts of the SP group are not evidenced for books other than the Torah, statistics for the Torah are separated from those of the other books. All statistics are based on the data in *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 8.

In the forty-six Torah texts that are sufficiently extensive for analysis (out of a total of 51 such texts), 24 (52%) reflect MT (or are equally close to the MT and SP), 17 are non-aligned (37%), 3 *exclusively* reflect SP (6.5%), and 2 the LXX (4.5%). In the remainder of Hebrew Scripture, in the seventy-five texts that are sufficiently extensive for analysis (out of a total of 76 such texts), 33 texts (44%) reflect MT (or are equally close to the MT and LXX), 40 are non-aligned (53%), 2 reflect the LXX (3%). The overall preponderance of MT and non-aligned texts in the Qumran corpus is thus evident, in the Torah more MT and in the other books more the non-aligned texts. These percentages are quite significant, and they are telling about the preferences of the Qumran community, but they are remote from the other sites in the Judean Desert, where all the texts belong to the inner circle of the medieval MT (above § 4A).

α. *Texts Written in the Qumran Scribal Practice*. It has been suggested, especially by the present author, that a large group of Qumran texts stand apart from the other ones because of their common use of a distinctive orthography, morphology, and a set of scribal practices.[54] It was recognized that a whole series of scribal features occurs almost exclusively in texts that display a certain system of orthography and morphology. The fact that virtually all the sectarian texts from Qumran reflect this combined set of features has led to the suggestion that these texts had been copied by the group of people who left the texts behind in the Qumran caves, possibly written at Qumran itself, although this is not a necessary part of the hypothesis. It is not claimed that these mentioned features are characteristic of the Qumran scribal practice only. It is only assumed that within the corpus of the texts found at Qumran these features display a peculiar distribution. Likewise, *tefillin* that were written in the Qumran scribal practice do not reflect the rabbinic prescriptions for the contents of the *tefillin,*[55] while the *tefillin* not written in the Qumran scribal practice, do so. On the basis of these criteria it is now possible to identify a group of biblical texts reflecting the

[54] *Scribal Practices*, 261–73 (with references to literature and earlier formulations of this theory). For criticisms, see J. Lübbe, "Certain Implications of the Scribal Process of *4QSam*^{c}," *RevQ* 14 (1989–1990) 255–65. Cross describes the orthography of these texts as a "baroque style" and he includes the morphological features under the heading of orthography: F. M. Cross, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in Trebolle, *Madrid Qumran Congress,* 1–14. See my reply, ibid., 15–21; Dong-Hyuk Kim, "Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering Tov's 'Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004) 72–81; see my reply "Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim's Paper on 'Tov's Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004) 359–60.

[55] See chapter 4*, § 2 and also the supporting evidence analyzed by G. J. Brooke, "Deuteronomy 5–6 in the Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 57–70.

Qumran scribal practice. The great majority of these texts reflect a free approach to the biblical text which manifests itself in adaptations of unusual forms to the context, in frequent errors, in numerous corrections, and sometimes, also, in careless handwriting. This approach seemingly contradicts the strict approach of the Qumran covenanters to their Bible interpretation, but this contradiction is only apparent, as different aspects of life are involved.

The texts belonging to this group reflect different textual backgrounds. Some of them must have been copied from proto-Masoretic texts, but they cannot be identified any more, since the scribes made too many changes (thus, 1QIsa^{a} could have been copied from 1QIsa^{b} or a similar text, but because of his free approach, this assumption cannot be verified [see chapter* 5]). In other cases, the textual background of the texts can more readily be identified, as in the case of texts copied from a text close to SP (4QNum^{b}; see further group γ below). The sectarian scribe of 4QSam^{c} probably copied from a text that was both close to MT and to LXX^{Luc} in 2 Samuel 14–15, which in that section probably reflects the OG translation, and should therefore be named non-aligned. The majority of the texts written in the Qumran practice are characterized as non-aligned (group ε below) because of their many contextual changes.

The twenty-five texts written in the Qumran practice (not all equally convincing), often described as typical Qumran texts, comprise a sizable group among the Qumran biblical texts. Probably the base texts of most *pesharim* reflecting all the elements of the Qumran practice, belonged to this group as well. The percentage of this group within the corpus of Qumran biblical texts is *not* expressed in statistical terms in the overall statistical analysis, since they are included in the statistics of the other four categories, which together add up to 100 percent. At the same time, it is noteworthy that 21 percent of the Qumran biblical scrolls were copied by the Qumran community, a far cry from the percentage which was assumed during the first two generations of Qumran research, namely 100 percent.

If indeed a large segment of the Qumran scrolls has been penned down by Qumran scribes, it is remarkable that they contain no sectarian readings.[56]

β. *Proto-Masoretic (Proto-Rabbinic) Texts*. Proto-Masoretic texts contain the consonantal framework of MT one thousand years or more before the time of

[56] Thus G. J. Brooke, "E Pluribus Unum – Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000) 107–19; idem, "Deuteronomy 5–6 in the Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 57–70; E. Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in *The Bible as Book,* 179–95. On the other hand, two scholars believe that such sectarian readings are embedded in the text: A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches, Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 95–6; P. Pulikottil, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran – The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa^{a}* (JSOTSup 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

the Masora codices. They do not seem to reflect any special textual characteristics beyond their basic agreement with MT. These texts are usually named proto-Masoretic, but the term "proto-rabbinic," used by F. M. Cross,[57] probably better describes their nature. [58]

The exclusive closeness of fifty-seven Qumran texts to the medieval texts (see above) is remarkable, while textual identity is spotted only for the texts from the other sites in the Judaean Desert (see § 4A).

γ. *Pre-Samaritan Texts*. The pre-Samaritan Qumran texts (4QpaleoExod^{m}, 4QExod-Lev^{f}, and 4QNum^{b}, and secondarily also 4QDeut^{n} and possibly 4QLev^{d})[59] reflect the characteristic features of the later SP with the exception of the latter's ideological readings, but they occasionally deviate from it.[60] It appears that one of the texts of this group formed the basis of SP, in which the Samaritan ideological changes and phonological features were inserted. A major characteristic feature of these texts is the content editing of the earlier texts as described in chapter 6*, and further the preponderance of contextually harmonizing readings.[61] Some scholars name this group "Palestinian," and there is much justification for this characterization, since these texts are not evidenced outside Palestine. The use of this term is, however, problematic, since it may imply that no other texts or groups of texts were extant in Palestine.

The three pre-Samaritan texts comprise no more than *6.5* percent of the Qumran biblical texts of the Torah. Although this is a small group, it is very significant for our understanding of the transmission of the Hebrew Bible.

δ. *Texts Close to the Presumed Hebrew Source of the LXX*. Although no text was found at Qumran that is identical or almost identical to the presumed Hebrew source of the LXX, a few texts are very close to that translation: 4QJer^{b,d} bear a strong resemblance to the LXX in characteristic details, with regard both to the arrangement of the verses and to their shorter text.[62] Similarly close to the LXX, though not to the same extent, are 4QLev^{d} (also close to SP), 4QDeut^{q}, and

---

[57] F. M. Cross, Jr., "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964) 281–99, esp. 287–92; idem, "Some Notes" (p. 9).

[58] The Qumran proto-Masoretic group ought to be investigated with regard to possible clusters within this group regarding spelling and content, but because of the paucity of overlapping Qumran texts, this investigation will be very limited. A possible clustering of 1QIsa^{a,b} and 4QIsa^{c,d} (of which 1QIsa^{a} and 4QIsa^{c} reflect the Qumran scribal practice in their orthography), against the medieval text, is visible. See chapter 5*, § 4.

[59] This text is also quoted in 4QTestimonia; see n. 31.

[60] See chapter 6* and E. Tov, "Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch," in *The Samaritans* (ed. A. D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1989) 397–407; N. Jastram, "A Comparison of Two 'Proto-Samaritan' Texts from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^{m} and 4QNum^{b}," *DSD* 5 (1998) 264–89.

[61] As a result the group as a whole was named harmonistic by Eshel, "4QDeut^{n}."

[62] See *TCHB*, 319–27.

secondarily also 4QSam[a] (close to the main tradition of the LXX and LXX[Luc]; see below, group ε),[63] 4QNum[b], and according to Cross (*DJD* XII, 84) also 4QExod[b]. Individual agreements with the LXX are also found in additional texts, in a somewhat large proportion in 4QDeut[c,h,j], but these texts actually belong to group ε.

There is insufficient evidence for speculating on the internal relation between the texts that are close to the LXX. In any event, they should not be considered a textual group. They do not form a close-knit textual family like the Masoretic family or the pre-Samaritan group. They represent individual copies that in the putative stemma of the biblical texts happened to be close to the Hebrew text from which the LXX was translated. Since in each of the books of the LXX its *Vorlage* was a single biblical text, and not a family, recension, or revision, the recognition of Hebrew scrolls that were close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX is thus of limited importance to our understanding of the relation between these texts, but it does have bearing on our understanding of the nature of the LXX and its *Vorlage*. The four texts which are close to the LXX comprise 4.5 percent of the Qumran biblical texts in the Torah (2 texts) and 3 percent in the other books (2 texts).

ε. *Non-Aligned (Independent) Texts*. Many Qumran texts are not exclusively close to either the MT, LXX, or SP and are therefore considered non-aligned. That is, they agree sometimes with MT against the other texts, and sometimes with SP and/or the LXX against the other texts. They furthermore contain readings not known from other texts. Usually the employment of the term "non-aligned" merely implies that the texts under consideration follow an inconsistent pattern of agreements and disagreements with the MT, LXX, and SP. These statistically independent texts are mentioned in § d below. However, the texts that are most manifestly non-aligned are texts that contain (groups of) readings that diverge significantly from the other texts, such as 4QReworked Pentateuch (4QRP = 4Q158, 4Q364–367). 4QRP exhibits long stretches of uninterrupted text that may be classified as Scripture such as found in either MT or the SP group.[64] This composition rearranges some Torah pericopes,[65] and it has a relatively small number of extensive exegetical additions.[66] In all these pluses, 4QRP resembles the Hebrew compositions behind the Greek 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel.[67] Other

[63] For an analysis, see Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls." F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel[a] (4Q51)," *DSD* 13 (2006) 46–60 describe this scroll as follows: "4QSam[a] stands firmly rooted in the Hebrew textual tradition reflected in the Old Greek …" (p. 54).

[64] The pre-Samaritan text is clearly the underlying text of 4Q158 and 4Q364, and possibly so in the case of 4Q365 (see *DJD* XIII, 192–6). On the other hand, A. Kim, "The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 (Fragments 8a–b, 9a–b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii)," *Textus* 21 (2002) 45–69 claims that 4Q365 is not close to SP.

[65] See chapter 20*, n. 115.

[66] See chapter 20*, § D.

[67] See chapter 20* and Tov, "Many Forms."

independent texts are 4QJosh[a], and 4QJudg[a]. 4QSam[a] holds a special position in this regard, since it is closely related to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, while reflecting independent features as well.

Special sub-groups of non-aligned texts are scrolls written for a specific purpose, viz., "excerpted" texts, such as 4QExod[d], 4QDeut[j,n], and 4QCant[a,b] and "liturgical" texts, such as most Psalm texts from caves 4 and 11 (see chapters 4* and 6*). These fifty-seven independent texts comprise 37 percent of the Qumran biblical texts in the Torah (17 texts) and 53 percent in the other books (40 texts). This analysis followed the customary nomenclature for the Qumran scrolls that considers the liturgical and excerpted scrolls equally biblical as all other scrolls. However, if they are excluded from the statistics, since they are no regular biblical texts, the number of biblical scrolls would have to be decreased by some forty items, and the number of independent texts would be much smaller.

Whether we assume that all the aforementioned texts were written at Qumran, or that only some were written there, while others were brought from elsewhere, the coexistence of the different categories of texts in the Qumran caves is noteworthy. The fact that all these different texts were found in the same caves probably reflects textual plurality for the period between the third century BCE and the first century CE.[68] Within that textual plurality the large number of proto-Masoretic texts probably indicates their importance, while the large number of independent texts underline the special condition of the transmission of the biblical text. Since there is no evidence concerning the circumstances of the depositing of the scrolls in the caves or concerning the different status of scrolls within the Qumran sect, no solid conclusions can be drawn about the approach of the Qumranites towards the biblical text. But it is safe to say that they paid no special attention to textual differences such as described here (see n. 31).

That all these different groups of texts coexisted at Qumran, and in Palestine as a whole, shows that no fixed text or textual family had been accepted as the central text for the country as a whole. However, that assumption may be misleading, since in certain milieus in Palestine one of the texts or textual families could still be the only accepted text. This, we believe, is the case for the Masoretic family which probably was the only acceptable text in temple circles and therefore very influential elsewhere. The purest form of MT, transmitted without much change into the Middle Ages, was found at Masada, as well in the somewhat later sites

[68] In recent years, the terms "pluriformity" and "uniformity" have appeared frequently in the scholarly discussion. See A. van der Kooij, "The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries," *The Bible as Book,* 167–77 (170–71). All agree that at a certain point there was uniformity, but scholars disagree as to how this uniformity was obtained. The term itself, as well as "stabilization," may be misleading, as these terms presuppose a certain movement towards that unity, which actually did not take place. When the archeological evidence shows us that in the first century CE MT is the sole force in power, this situation does not reflect a *Kulturkampf* between different texts, but it resulted from the fact that other texts simply ceased to exist after the destruction of the Second Temple.

Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Ḥever, Wadi Murabba'at, and Naḥal Ṣe'elim (period of the Bar Kochba revolt). This was the inner circle of MT as found in the temple circles, and in all these sites MT (actually, the proto-Masoretic or proto-Rabbinic text) was the sole text used (see chapter 12*). The sociological data known about Masada fit into this picture since the community that lived there would have adhered to the rabbinic text. This assumption also applies to the other sites, reflecting a reality from the time of the Second Jewish Revolt (135 CE).[69] The proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran (group β) formed a second transmission circle copied from the inner circle.

If the recognition of the aforementioned five groups of texts is correct, by definition some of the textual theories that have been suggested in the last century cannot be maintained, especially because of our fifth group (non-aligned texts), which is composed of texts not connected with the MT, LXX, or SP. The assumption of such a group allows for an endless number of individual texts, thus eliminating the possibility that all the Qumran texts, and in fact all ancient Hebrew texts, ultimately derived from a tripartite division of the textual sources. Elsewhere we have tried to refute that view,[70] claiming that the textual sources of the Bible cannot be reduced to three traditions and that these textual traditions are no recensions or text-types, but that they are simply "texts." It should however be conceded that my own view, like all other views, is based on certain suppositions; it is equally subjective, and like the other views, it cannot be proven. The texts themselves should remain our point of departure, but Davila's study[71] shows how difficult it is to find acceptable criteria. In the wake of others, Davila takes as his point of departure that the MT and SP of these books are text-types, rather than texts, and he suggests that they, together with the Qumran texts, belong to the same text-type, and that the LXX reflects a different text-type.[72] Most of the Qumran texts of Genesis and Exodus examined by Davila are indeed close to MT, but the material is simply too fragmentary to prove that the Qumran texts together with the MT and SP comprise one textual entity and that this entity is a text-type.

---

[69] Young, "Stabilization" (see n. 16) explains the differences between the Qumran and Masada corpora as not reflecting different sociological and chronological realities, but as reflecting different periods. In his view, the Qumran corpus as a whole (deposited in the caves in the first century BCE!) preceded that of Masada.

[70] *TCHB,* 155–60.

[71] J. R. Davila, "Text-Type and Terminology: Genesis and Exodus as Test Cases," *RevQ* 16 (1993) 3–37.

[72] In our view, however, the MT and SP of Genesis and Exodus differ sufficiently in order to be considered different entities, often recensionally different. The LXX reflects yet a third text, often recensionally different, especially in the genealogies in chapters 5 and 11 and in Genesis 31. But this evidence does not suffice to prove either our view or the views of Davila (reiterating those of others).

The status of the Greek manuscripts from the Judean Desert runs parallel to that of the Hebrew texts (see chapter 23*, § III).

d. Evidence for the Individual Biblical Books

Each Scripture book reflects a different textual pattern. The main problem inherent in this analysis is the coincidence of the textual transmission causing certain texts to be preserved, while others have perished. Thus, the Qumran evidence shows the existence of two different literary editions of Jeremiah (below, § e), but similar editorial processes may have taken place in other books as well, which coincidentally have not been preserved. The analysis, based on fragments large enough for textual analysis (as listed in *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 8), pertains to the Qumran evidence only. The manuscripts from the other Judean Desert sites reflects only MT (see § 4A).

In the Torah an approach of limited scribal intervention, greater precision, and less textual diversity could have been expected. However, there is no indication that the development of divergent texts and the textual transmission of the Torah differs from that of the other Scripture books. Among other things, a number of Torah scrolls are written in the careless and inconsistent system of the Qumran scribal practice (2QExod^{b}?, 4Q[Gen-]Exod^{b}, 4QExod^{j}?, 2QNum^{b}?, 4QNum^{b}, 1QDeut^{a,c}?, 2QDeut^{c}?, 4QDeut^{j,k1,k2,m}).

The great majority of the ten Genesis texts reflect either MT or the combined evidence of MT and SP. The LXX deviates from this often-common text in small details, large enough to recognize that the Qumran texts do not reflect that text. None of the Genesis texts is written in the Qumran scribal practice. 4QGen^{k} is non-aligned.

The nine texts of Exodus diverge substantially. Three texts reflect the Qumran scribal practice: 2QExod^{b}?, 4Q[Gen-]Exod^{b}, 4QExod^{j}?, two of them textually independent. In this book the differences between the MT, LXX, and SP are clear-cut, so that the affinities of the Qumran fragments can often be determined. 4QpaleoExod^{m} is very close to SP, without the latter's sectarian readings, and according to Cross,[73] 4QExod-Lev^{f} also belongs to this category. Two texts are close to MT. Four texts are statistically independent. 4QExod^{d} is independent in terms of content, omitting a large section.

Five of the ten manuscripts of Leviticus are equally close to MT and SP (these two texts do not differ much from each other in Leviticus): Statistically independent are 11QpaleoLev^{a} and 11QLev^{b}. On the whole the manuscripts of Leviticus are rather homogeneous, probably due to their contents.[74]

---

[73] *DJD* XII, 136.

[74] For an analysis, see P. W. Flint, "The Book of Leviticus in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Book of Leviticus, Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; Leiden/ Boston: E. J. Brill, 2003) 323–41.

The two manuscripts of Numbers are written in the Qumran scribal practice (2QNum^{b}?, 4QNum^{b}). In its major deviations 4QNum^{b} is close to both SP and the LXX, and at the same time contains many independent readings.

Of the twenty manuscripts of Deuteronomy[75] eight are equally close to MT and SP, and six are written in the Qumran scribal practice (see above). The textual nature of 4QDeut^{j,n} cannot be classified easily, since they probably represent excerpted texts, probably for liturgical purposes. Eight manuscripts are statistically independent. 4QDeut^{q} is close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX.[76]

One of the two Joshua texts is close to MT (4QJosh^{b}),[77] while 4QJosh^{a} is contentswise independent, probably reflecting a different literary edition – see § e.

One of the three texts of Judges may reflect a different literary edition (4QJudg^{a}) – see § e.

Two of the four texts of Samuel are close to MT (1QSam, 4QSam^{b}), one is close to the LXX, 4QSam^{a} [78] with features of an independent text, while 4QSam^{c}, written in the Qumran scribal practice, is both close to MT and to LXX^{Luc}, and therefore textually independent.

4QKgs reflects MT. 6QpapKings is independent.

Of the fourteen Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah nine are close to MT and secondarily also to the LXX. Two texts, written in the Qumran scribal practice (1QIsa^{a} and 4QIsa^{c}) as well as 4QIsa^{k} are independent.

Two of the five Jeremiah manuscripts are close to MT (4QJer^{a,c}). 2QJer written in the Qumran practice, is statistically independent, and two are close to the LXX (4QJer^{b,d}).

Two of the three manuscripts of Ezekiel are close to MT (4QEzek^{b}, 11QEzek). 4QEzek^{a} is statistically independent.

Five of the seven manuscripts of the Minor Prophets, three of them written in the Qumran practice, are statistically independent.

Five of the thirty-one Psalm texts written in the Qumran scribal practice, are statistically independent. Most of the Psalm texts reflect a textual tradition different from MT and the other textual witnesses. At least seven collections of psalms from caves 4 and 11 contain Psalms in a sequence different from MT, sometimes with additional psalms added to the canonical ones.[79] Furthermore, a major feature of the Qumran corpus is that it contains no evidence of any scroll clearly supporting the Masoretic Psalter except for 4QPs^{c}. Outside Qumran, this collection is represented in MasPs^{a,b} and 5/6ḤevPs. If the view suggested by

[75] See F. García Martínez, "Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda et le Deutéronome," in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994) 63–82; S. A. White, "Three Deuteronomic Manuscripts from Cave 4, Qumran," *JBL* 112 (1993) 23–42.

[76] For an analysis, see Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls," esp. 29–30.

[77] Thus Tov, *DJD* XIV.

[78] See n. 63.

[79] See chapter 4*, § 2j.

Sanders, Wilson, and Flint according to which these scrolls reflect alternative biblical Psalters, carries the day, it implies that the psalm texts from caves 4 and 11 constitute the group of Qumran evidence which deviates most from MT. However, the arguments adduced in the past in favor of the assumption that 11QPs[a] reflects a liturgical collection also hold with regard to the texts from cave 4,[80] and this view seems preferable to us. The deviations from MT pertain to both the sequence of the individual psalms and the addition and omission of psalms, among them non-canonical Psalms.

Two of the four texts of Job are close to MT, but in this book no other textual traditions are known since the greatly deviating LXX text was probably shortened by the translator himself.

Both texts of Proverbs are close to MT.

All four texts of Ruth are equally close to the MT and LXX.

All three texts of Canticles are independent, one statistically (6QCant) and two contentswise, probably reflecting excerpted texts (4QCant[a,b]).[81]

The one text of Qohelet (4QQoh[a]), written in the Qumran scribal practice, is textually independent.

One of the four texts of Lamentations, written in the Qumran scribal practice, 4QLam, is textually independent.

Five of the six texts of Daniel are independent, while one is close to MT. Also the other texts are closer to MT than to the LXX.

The one text of Ezra-Nehemiah (4QEzra) is close to MT.

The one text of Chronicles (4QChron) contains text beyond MT, and should probably be classified as independent, although it is too short for analysis. Possibly this fragment does not reflect the canonical book of Chronicles.[82]

e. Textual Transmission and Literary Criticism

The relevance of the textual witnesses for certain aspects of the literary analysis has often been discussed, especially in the last two decades. For the following Qumran scrolls their contribution to literary criticism has been noticed (for all these, see chapter 11*, § 2).

4QPhyl A,B,J (shorter text in Deuteronomy 5, lacking Deut 5:29–30 [32–33]).[83]

---

[80] 11QPs[a] contains prose as well as poetry sections showing the purpose of the collection (focus on David). To one of the Psalms (Psalm 145) the scroll added liturgical antiphonal additions.

[81] See chapter 4*, § 2i.

[82] See the analysis of G. J. Brooke, "The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran," *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. R. Rezetko et al.; VTSup 113; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2007) 35–48.

[83] See the analysis of A. Rofé, "Deuteronomy 5:28–6:1: Composition and Text in the Light of Deuteronomic Style and Three *Tefillin* from Qumran (4Q 128, 129, 137)," *Henoch* 7 (1985) 1–14; idem, "Historico-Literary Aspects of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," in Schiffman, *Dead*

4QJosh[a] (different editorial strands; occasionally a shorter text).
4QJudg[a] (shorter text of chapter 6).
4QSam[a] (different edition of the Song of Hannah).
1QIsa[a] (different stages of the development of 2 Kgs 20:1–11).[84]
4QJer[b,d] (shorter text and different arrangement).[85]
4QPs[x] (earlier text edition).[86]

According to some scholars, the different arrangements of the various deviating Psalms scrolls (see above, § 4Bd) also are relevant to the literary criticism of the Bible, since they display texts differing recensionally from MT and the other witnesses.

Sea Scrolls, 30–39. On the other hand, G. J. Brooke, "Deuteronomy 5–6 in the Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 57–70 ascribes the idiosyncrasies of these phylacteries to the Qumran scribes.

[84] See further E. Ulrich, "The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah: Light from 1QIsa[a] on Additions in the MT," *DSD* 8 (2001) 288–305.

[85] See chapter 26*, notes 65, 71, 77.

[86] Thus P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and P. W. Flint, *DJD* XVI.

Chapter Eleven

The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources

1. Background

The contribution of the LXX to the literary criticism of the canonical books of the Hebrew Bible has gained increasing interest in recent years both by scholars specializing in the Hebrew Bible and by LXX specialists. The presence of special elements in the LXX that may date to early periods in the history of the biblical books has always intrigued scholars.[1] Before turning to the general background of these elements, which are not evenly spread in the books of the Bible, we present a brief survey[2] of the evidence relating to the contribution of textual to literary criticism in the canonical books.[3]

---

[1] On Samuel, see Wellhausen, *Samuel;* O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt* (KEH; ed. M. Löhr; 3d ed.; Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1898); N. Peters, *Beiträge zur Text- und Literarkritik sowie zur Erklärung der Bücher Samuel* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1899). Some earlier and later studies were analyzed by D. Barthélemy, "L'enchevêtrement." Several studies, but by no means all those relevant, are mentioned in the following notes while, in addition, many others are referred to in the notes of my own study mentioned in n. 2. In addition, see the following general studies, in chronological sequence: N. C. Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament* (GBS, Old Testament Series; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971); R. Stahl, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte des hebräischen Bibel-Textes als Problem der Textkritik – Ein Beitrag zu gegenwärtig vorliegenden textgeschichtlichen Hypothesen und zur Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Text- und Literarkritik*, Ph.D. diss., Friedrich-Schiller-University, Jena, 1978 <cf. *TLZ* 105 (1980) 475–8>; the articles collected by Lust, *Ezekiel*; H.-J. Stipp, "Das Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik in neueren alttestamentlichen Veröffentlichungen," *BZ* n.s. 1 (1990) 16–37; idem, "Textkritik – Literarkritik – Textentwicklung – Überlegungen zur exegetischen Aspektsystematik," *ETL* 66 (1990) 143–59; J. Trebolle Barrera, *La Biblia judía y la Biblia cristiana* (Madrid: Trotta, 1993) 412–27 = *Jewish Bible*, 390–404; Z. Talshir, "The Contribution of Diverging Traditions Preserved in the Septuagint to Literary Criticism of the Bible," in Greenspoon–Munnich, *VIII Congress*, 21–41; eadem, "Synchronic Approaches" (see chapter 20*, n. 1); Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls*; further bibliography is found in the detailed descriptions of the individual books in P.-M. Bogaert, "Septante et versions grecques," *DBSup* XII (Paris 1993 [1994]) cols. 536–692, esp. 576–650.

[2] See further my *Greek and Hebrew Bible* and *TCU*.

[3] The last chapter in my *TCU* defines the nature of and boundary between "textual" and "literary criticism," and the relevance, paradoxical as it may seem, of textual sources to literary criticism. By the same token, a study by Z. Talshir is named: "The Contribution of Diverging Traditions Preserved in the Septuagint to Literary Criticism of the Bible" (see n. 1) and a long section in Trebolle Barrera, *Jewish Bible* is called "Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism,

The scope of the analysis should not be limited to the canonical shape of the Hebrew Bible. Previously[4] I thought that only reflections of early editorial stages such as those in the LXX of Jeremiah and Ezekiel were relevant to the literary analysis of the Hebrew Bible, while those subsequent to the MT edition are not, pertaining only to exegesis. However, such a distinction is incorrect, since both types of evidence are relevant to literary analysis and exegesis.[5]

One group of literary divergences should, in my view, always be excluded from the present discussion, namely large-scale differences between MT S T V and LXX that can demonstrably be assigned to the translators themselves.[6] Only if a Greek version reflects an underlying Semitic text, may it be thought of as representing a link in the chain of the literary development of the book.[7]

Duplicate and Double Editions" (pp. 390–404). Also Ulrich speaks often about "duplicate and double editions" (see n. 22 below).

[4] The literary investigation of the *canonical* books of the Hebrew Bible is joined by textual data, which I formulated as follows at an earlier stage of my thinking: "the redactional stage reflected in MT S T V represents the lower limit of the literary analysis, while literary developments *subsequent* to that stage are located beyond the scope of literary analysis in the traditional sense of the word. Such later developments may be important for the subsequent understanding of the literary shape of the canonical books, but they really belong to the realm of exegesis. Thus, from the point of view of the canonical Hebrew shape of the book, the additional headers of the Psalms in the LXX and Peshitta are exponents of exegesis beyond the MT edition, and so are probably the so-called apocryphal Additions in the LXX versions of Esther and Daniel. If several of the large-scale additions and changes in the LXX of 1 Kings are midrashic, as suggested by Gooding (see chapter 20,* n. 24), they too are later than the canonical shape of the Hebrew Bible. In *TCU*, 240 I therefore still said: "The purpose being thus defined, literary developments subsequent to the edition of MT S T V are excluded from the discussion. This pertains to presumed midrashic developments in the books of Kings, Esther, and Daniel reflected in the LXX*." However, there is now room for a more refined appraisal of the data.

[5] The literary development between the assumed first, short, edition of Jeremiah (LXX, 4QJer^{b,d}) and the second one (MT S T V) is exegetical, and is of major interest for scholarship as it presumably preceded the edition included in MT S T V. At the same time, had the LXX of Jeremiah preserved an edition subsequent to that of MT S T V, one that may have been termed midrashic, it should have been of similar interest. This is the case with the LXX forms of Esther, Daniel, and 1 Kings (see chapter 20*), and therefore the major deviations from MT in these books should not be brushed aside because they possibly postdate the MT edition. Besides, another aspect should also be taken into consideration: some scholars consider the literary divergences in Esther and Daniel anterior to the literary shape of MT S T V (see below), while others regard them as subsequent to that edition. It would therefore be safest to consider all these series of divergences relevant to literary analysis.

[6] Obviously, it is difficult to make a distinction between differences created by translators and similar ones found in the translator's *Vorlage*, but when such a distinction can be made, the translator's input should be considered exegetical only, and not relevant to the literary history of the book. See below, group 4.

[7] The situation is a little more complicated, since the LXX developed from its status as a mere translation of the Hebrew Bible to an independent literary source for generations of Christian interpretations. Nevertheless, the literary shape of the LXX is less relevant to literary criticism of the Hebrew Bible if it was created by a translator.

2. The Evidence of the LXX

When turning to the evidence of the LXX, in spite of the open approach advocated in § 1 above, the description nevertheless makes a distinction between different types of material in the LXX. The following relevant LXX evidence is known to me, although undoubtedly more data are waiting for literary analysis in the treasure stores of that translation.[8]

a. In several books, major elements in the text of the LXX have been recognized as reflecting an *earlier* edition of a biblical book or chapter(s). No consensus has been reached on the nature of most of the literary divergences between textual witnesses, thus rendering this summary subjective, stressing certain divergences between the LXX and MT S T V, while omitting others. In each instance, some scholars express a different opinion on what is considered here a redactional difference between the LXX and MT S T V; for example, when someone ascribes the divergence to a translator's tendency to expand or shorten. In all these cases, we make a shortcut in the description when accepting here, without analysis, the view that a translator found before him a different Hebrew text, while cases in which the translator presumably shortened or expanded his *Vorlage* are mentioned in group *4*.

In four instances, the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX differed from MT S T V mainly with regard to its shortness (see *TCHB*, chapter 7).

– The most clear-cut case is Jeremiah in which the LXX (joined by 4QJer^{b,d}), some fifteen percent shorter than MT in its number of words, verses, and pericopes, and sometimes arranged differently (chapter 10 and the oracles against the nations), reflects an earlier edition, often named "edition I." The second edition added various new ideas. See chapter 26*, notes 66, 71, and 77.

– The LXX of Ezekiel is 4–5 percent shorter than MT S T V and in one case (7:3–9) the arrangement of the two editions differed much, involving new ideas. Furthermore, two small sections (12:26–28 and 32:25–26) and one large section (36:2–8) are lacking in P.Chester Beatty (Pap. 967) dating to the second or early third century CE, in the latter case attested to also in La^{Wirc}. According to Lust, probably all three sections were lacking in the Old Greek translation as well as its Hebrew source.[9]

---

[8] Earlier less complete lists were provided by Swete, *Introduction*, 242–64; O. Munnich in *Bible grecque*, 172–82; Trebolle Barrera, *Jewish Bible*, 390–404.

[9] J. Lust, "Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel," in *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible,* 83–92. See also earlier studies by Lust: "De samenhang van Ez. 36–40," *TvT* 20 (1980) 26–39; "Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 517–33. See further P.-M. Bogaert, "Le témoignage de la Vetus Latina dans l'étude de la tradition des Septante: Ezéchiel et Daniel dans le papyrus 967," *Bib* 59 (1978) 384–95. Lust noted that the minuses in 12:26–28 and 32:25–26 could have been created by way of *parablepsis* (note the same phrases at the beginnings and endings of the minuses), but he considered the assumption of a shorter text more likely. In all three cases, the main manuscripts of the LXX reflect a longer text, like

– The LXX of 1 Samuel 16–18 is significantly shorter than MT S T V (by some forty-five percent) and apparently represents one version of the story of David and Goliath, to which a second one, with different tendencies, was juxtaposed in the edition of MT S T V which therefore contains a composite account.

– The list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem in the LXX of Nehemiah 11 (2 Esdras 21) is considerably shorter than in MT S T V in vv 25–35, and possibly more original, displaying two different stages in the development of the list.[10] That list or those lists are again different from the parallel list in 1 Chronicles 9.[11]

In several other instances the differences between the two literary editions pertain to *more than one aspect* of the text and not only to length.

– The edition of Joshua reflected in the LXX differs in several ways from MT S T V. In some segments, the LXX is shorter (possibly joined by 4QJosh[a] frg. 18 in Josh 8:14–18) and in other segments it is longer (note especially the end of Joshua in the LXX pointing to a shorter, combined version of Joshua–Judges), and in yet other pericopes different details are found, including the different position of Josh 8:30–35 of MT.[12]

– In Genesis, the SP and LXX (albeit with differences between them) on the one hand, and MT S T V on the other, differ systematically in their presentation of the chronological data in the genealogies, especially in chapters 5, 8, and 11. The originality of any one system has not been determined.

– In the Song of Hannah, three parallel editions in MT, LXX, and 4QSam[a] display distinct theological tendencies.[13]

MT; the longer Greek text was created secondarily, according to Lust, who recognized signs of lateness in the main text of 12:26–28 and 36:23–38. Lust also recognized common themes in the segments that would have been added in Hebrew and later in Greek ("eschatological and apocalyptic themes").

[10] See *TCU*, 257. According to D. Böhler, "On the Relationship between Textual and Literary Criticism–Two Recensions of the Book of Ezra: Ezra–Neh (MT) and 1 Esdras (LXX), in *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible,* 35–50 (48), the MT edition reflects a geographical reality of Maccabean times.

[11] See, in great detail, G. N. Knoppers, "Sources, Revisions, and Editions: The Lists of Jerusalem's Residents in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9," *Textus* 20 (2000) 141–68. Knoppers (p. 167) talks about "two stages in the growth of a single literary unit."

[12] Beyond the analyses adduced in *TCU*, different editions of the same unit in Joshua were described in detail by L. Mazor, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua – Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994 (Heb. with Eng. summ.). Singled out for treatment were: the account of the Israelites' circumcision at the Hill of Foreskins (5:2–9), the curse upon the rebuilder of Jericho (6:26), the victory at Ai (8:1–29), and the tribal allotment (according to Mazor, the LXX almost always reflects an earlier text, and MT shows signs of lateness and revision). In Joshua 24, A. Rofé described the variants of the LXX as reflecting a coherent picture: "The Story of the Assembly in Sichem (Josh 24:1–28, 31)," *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress for Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1999) 17–25.

[13] *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, chapter 29.

– 1–2 Kings displays extensive chronological differences between MT S T V and the LXX with regard to synchronisms and the counting of the years of the divided monarchy. According to several scholars (see *TCU*, 253), the chronological system underlying the LXX has been altered to the system now reflected in MT. Also in matters of content, the Greek version of 1–2 Kings (3–4 Reigns) differs recensionally much from MT. The Greek version could reflect a later version of the Hebrew book (see below), or a redactional stage anteceding that of MT. In his study of 1 Kings 2–14, A. Schenker accepts the second possibility, assuming that the edition of MT S T V changed the earlier edition reflected in the LXX.[14] Equally old elements are found in the LXX version of 1 Kgs 20:10–20 mentioning groups of dancing men as well as King David's dances, elements which were removed from MT, according to Schenker, probably in the second century BCE.

– The Greek text of Chronicles is sometimes redactionally shorter,[15] while in one case it adds elements.[16]

– According to Pohlmann and Böhler, the literary shape of several chapters in 1 Esdras is older than the MT edition of the parallel chapters in Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles.[17] Böhler describes in detail how 1 Esdras depicts the situation in Jerusalem differently from the picture drawn by Ezra-Nehemiah. In Esdras, Jerusalem was inhabited at the time of Zerubbabel and Ezra, while in Ezra-Nehemiah this occurred during Nehemiah's time.[18]

---

[14] Schenker, *Septante*. Schenker dates the MT edition to between 250 and 130 BCE, probably closer to the later end of this spectrum (see pp. 36–7, 152–3). Among other things, Schenker's view is based on the Greek version of 1 Kgs 2:35. According to the MT of this verse, Solomon appointed "Zadok the priest" instead of Ebiatar, while according to the LXX, Zadok was appointed as "the first priest." Schenker considers LXX the earlier version reflecting the appointment of the high priests by the kings, while MT reflects a later reality which was initiated with Simon Maccabee in 140 BCE when kings could no longer make such appointments. According to Schenker, MT repressed the earlier formulation in this case as well as in one other. The singular בית הבמות of MT 1 Kgs 12:31 and 2 Kgs 17:29, 32 replaced the earlier plural reading of οἴκους ἐφ ὑψηλῶν (et sim.) in the LXX. According to Schenker (pp. 144–6), the plural of the LXX reflected the earlier reality of more than one sanctuary in Shechem, which was changed by MT to reflect the building of a single Samaritan sanctuary. Therefore, this correction (also reflected in the OG, reconstructed from the Vetus Latina in Deut 27:4) may be dated to the period of the existence of a temple on Mt. Gerizim between 300 and 128 BCE.

[15] The text omits the posterity of Ham, except for the Cushites, and the longer of the two lists of the posterity of Shem (1 Chr 1:10–16, 17b–23).

[16] It adds elements from 2 Kgs 23:24–27, 31b–33 and 34:1–4 in 2 Chr 35:19a–d, 36:2a–c, 5a–d. For an analysis, see L. C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles* (VTSup 25; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974) 213–6.

[17] K.-F. Pohlmann, *Studien zum dritten Esra. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Schloss des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (FRLANT 104; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970).

[18] Various opinions, reviewed in 1991 by A. Schenker, have been suggested concerning its relation to the canonical books; according to Schenker himself, this book contains midrashic, and hence late, elements (pp. 246–8): A. Schenker, "La relation d'Esdras A' au texte massorétique d'Esdras-Néhémie," in *Tradition of the Text – Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of His 70th Birthday* (ed. G. J. Norton and S. Pisano; OBO 109; Freiburg/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 218–49.

– According to some scholars, the recensionally different editions of the LXX and "Lucianic" text (A-Text) of Esther preceded the edition of MT S T V.[19] According to Milik,[20] another early version of that book was reflected in 4Q550 and 4Q550^{a-e} (4QprEsther^{a-f} ar), although most scholars see no connection between these Qumran texts and the biblical book of Esther.[21]

– According to some scholars, the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Daniel differing recensionally from MT, especially in chapters 4–6, preceded that of MT.[22] In addition to the main text of the LXX, Pap. 967 displays the chapters in a different sequence (1–4, 7, 8, 5, 6, 9–12, Bel, Suzanna), an arrangement which may reflect an earlier edition.

– Smaller differences between the LXX and MT S T V are mentioned in *TCU* as "differences in sequence" (pp. 257–8) and "minor differences" (pp. 258–60). These smaller differences (such as Deut 6:4; 32:43 in the LXX) also may be relevant for literary analysis especially when combined into a larger picture or tendency.

b. In some cases, the LXX has been recognized as reflecting large-scale redactional differences from MT S T V which were created *after* the edition of MT.

– The OG of Esther reflects a rewritten book reworking a text like MT.[23] The A-Text ("Lucianic text")[24] likewise reflects a later text.[25]

---

[19] See *TCU*, 255. According to Clines and Fox, the L text reflects a different and pristine text, which helps us to reconstruct the development of the book. See D. J. A. Clines, *The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story* (JSOTSup 30; Sheffield, 1984); M. V. Fox, *The Redaction of the Books of Esther* (SBLMS 40; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991). As for the "Lucianic" text, this version has little to do with the Lucianic tradition in the other books of the LXX; see R. Hanhart, *Esther, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum, etc.,* VIII, 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) 87–95.

[20] J. T. Milik, "Les modèles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân," in *Mémorial J. Starcky* (ed. E. Puech and F. García Martínez; Paris: Gabalda, 1992) 321–406.

[21] See especially S. White Crawford, "Has Esther Been Found at Qumran? 4QProto-Esther and the Esther Corpus," *RevQ* 17 (1996) 315 ff.

[22] See O. Munnich, "Texte Massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel," in *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible*, 93–120; Albertz, *Daniel*. R. Grelot assumes a different editorial model in chapter 4, see "La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique," *RB* 81 (1974) 5–23; idem, "La chapitre V de Daniel dans la Septante," *Sem* 24 (1974) 45–66. A similar view on Daniel was developed on the basis of Notre Dame dissertations by D. O. Wenthe and S. P. Jeansonne by E. Ulrich, "Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated," in *DSS,* 34–50, esp. 40–44. According to Ulrich, the editions of both MT and the LXX (OG) reflect revised expansions of an earlier edition.

[23] See chapter 20*.

[24] See n. 19.

[25] See my *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, chapter 37. Also Jobes believes that the L text of Esther is based on a Hebrew original, much shorter than MT S T V, but very similar to that text where the two overlap: K. H. Jobes, *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (SBLDS 153; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996). On the other hand, K. de Troyer, *Het einde van de* Alpha-tekst *van Ester* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997) believes that L presents an inner-Greek revision not based on a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

– According to some scholars, the large-scale differences between MT S T V and LXX in 1 Kings belong to the same category.[26]

– The translator and reviser of Jeremiah considered Bar 1:1–3:8 an integral part of Jeremiah when including these chapters in the translation and, probably, revision, as shown by the Greek version of the second part of the book (Jeremiah 29–52 [according to the sequence of the LXX] + Bar 1:1–3:8).[27]

– The OG of Daniel 4–6 reflects a rewritten book of a text like MT.[28]

c. The editorial deviations of the LXX from MT S T V were described above as either preceding or following that edition.[29] In several instances, however, such a decision cannot be made; in these cases the existence of parallel Hebrew editions cannot be excluded. Thus, in the editorial differences between the LXX and MT S T V in Proverbs regarding the internal sequence of chapters and pericopes in chapters 24–31, no single sequence can be preferred. The LXX of Psalms differs from the edition of MT S T V in a few limited, but important, editorial details, namely the inclusion of Psalm 151 and the combining or separating of some Psalms differently from the edition of MT S T V.[30] The much deviating Greek text of Exodus 35–40 probably reflects a deviating Hebrew text.[31]

d. In yet other cases, when large-scale differences between the LXX and MT S T V were most likely created by the translators themselves, by definition they do not pertain to the literary development of the LXX, but rather to the exegesis of a single translator or reviser. This appears to be the case with the Greek translation of Job.[32]

3. The LXX and the Other Ancient Sources

In spite of the uncertainties described above, the LXX does reflect many large-scale redactional deviations from MT S T V. Before trying to understand the

---

[26] See chapter 20*.

[27] See my study *Jeremiah and Baruch.*

[28] See chapter 20*.

[29] Their inclusion in either group *1* or *2* is subjective and, as mentioned above, different opinions have been expressed on each group of variations.

[30] MT 9, 10 = LXX 9; MT 114, 115 = LXX 113; MT 116 = LXX 114 + 115; MT 147 = LXX 146 + 147.

[31] See chapter 20*, n. 7.

[32] This translation is one-sixth shorter than its counterpart in MT S T V, and also appears to have been created by a free translator who shortened his *Vorlage* considerably. See G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, I. *The Book of Job* (LUÅ 43, 2; Lund: Gleerup, 1946); D. H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job* (JBL Monograph Series 8; 1952); H. M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book Job, II," *HUCA* 29 (1958) 229–71. The free character of the Greek translation was analyzed in detail by J. Ziegler, "Der textkritische Wert der Septuaginta des Buches Job," *Sylloge, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 9–28.

unique relation between the LXX and MT S T V, the LXX's comparative position with regard to the other ancient sources should be evaluated.[33]

When comparing the LXX with the other ancient versions one notes that beyond MT, the LXX is the single most significant source of information pertaining to the editorial development of the biblical books. No such information is included in any other ancient version. Some evidence of the Old Latin runs parallel with the LXX,[34] but since that version was translated from Greek, this evidence points in the same direction as that of the LXX. A few deviations from MT in the Peshitta of Chronicles should also be mentioned.[35]

The LXX may also be compared with the SP and the pre-Samaritan Qumran texts (the SP-group) which likewise contain material that is significant on a literary level:

– 4QpaleoExod^{m}, 4QNum^{b}, and the later SP systematically reworked the recounting of Israel's history in Moses' first speech in Deuteronomy 1–3.[36]

– The SP and the pre-Samaritan Qumran texts systematically harmonized a *few* select stories in the Torah so as to avoid what they considered to be internal inconsistencies.[37]

---

[33] In this comparison, we try to assess the relation between the LXX and the other ancient sources, but in some instances we are not certain that the LXX reflects a different Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage* relevant to the literary history of the Bible. Nevertheless, in the following discussion it is taken for granted that the LXX does indeed reflect important differences in such books as Joshua, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, etc. At the same time, the situation is not as difficult as these remarks imply, since there is *some* external evidence supporting the aforementioned reconstruction of the LXX, namely 4QJer^{b,d} and 4QJosh^{a}, and some support from SP for the chronological deviations of the LXX from the MT of Genesis.

[34] This pertains to the shorter Old Latin version of Jeremiah 39 and 52: P.-M. Bogaert, "La libération de Jérémie et le meurtre de Godolias: le texte court (LXX) et la rédaction longue (TM)," in Fraenkel, *Septuaginta*, 312–22; see further Bogaert's study "L'importance de la Septante et du 'Monacensis' de la Vetus Latina pour l'exégèse du livre de l'Exode (chap. 35–40)," in M. Vervenne, *Studies in the Book of Exodus – Redaction – Reception – Interpretation* (BETL 126; Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1996) 399–427. This also pertains to the Old Latin version of Ezek 36:2– 8 in codex Wirceburgensis, as well as to individual readings, not involving large-scale variations, in the historical books as recognized by J. C. Trebolle Barrera: *Jehú y Joás. Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9–11 (*Institución San Jeronimo 17; Valencia, 1984); "From the 'Old Latin' through the 'Old Greek' to the 'Old Hebrew' (2 Kings 10,23–25)," *Textus* 11 (1984) 17–36; "La primitiva confesión de fe yahvista (1 Re 18,36–37). De la crítica textual a la teología bíblica," *Salmanticensis* 31 (1984) 181–205; "Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew in the Book of Kings (1 Ki. 18:27 and 2 Ki. 20:11)," *Textus* 13 (1986) 85–94; "Le texte de 2 Rois 7,20–8,5 à la lumière des découvertes de Qumrân (6Q4 15)," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 561–8.

[35] A few clusters of verses are lacking in this translation, e. g. 1 Chr 2:47–49; 4:16–18, 34–37; 7:34–38; 8:17–22.

[36] See chapter 6*.

[37] See ibid.

– The single most pervasive change in the SP is probably the rewritten Decalogue in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 involving the addition[38] of a sectarian tenth commandment[39] referring to the sanctity of Mount Gerizim.

All this material is comparable to the aforementioned LXX evidence and the Qumran evidence to be mentioned below. With regard to the SP group, all the evidence for redactional changes seems to be subsequent to the literary edition included in MT,[40] but that assumption does not make the material less important. The editing involved was meant to create a more perfect and internally consistent textual structure. However, the editing procedure itself was inconsistent, since certain details were changed while similar ones were left untouched.

This leads us to the Qumran biblical texts reflecting scattered information relevant to literary criticism and hence potentially parallel to the LXX. As in the case of the LXX, our assessment of the data is subjective, and furthermore the complexity of the comparison of the complete Qumran corpus with a single text, the LXX, is also problematic. However, it seems that such a comparison is legitimate, because the amalgam of the different books of the LXX is comparable to the Qumran corpus of biblical texts, even if the latter is more extensive than the LXX. The Qumran corpus is very fragmentary, but often the character of a book is recognizable in a small fragment, such as the Jeremiah fragments from cave 4. This analysis allows us to claim that the Qumran corpus, though much larger than the LXX, reflects much fewer literary differences of the type found in the LXX.

– 4QJer^{b,d}: The best example of early redactional evidence is probably found in these two texts whose evidence in shortness and sequence tallies with the LXX, while deviating from the edition of MT S T V.

– 4QJosh^{a}: The section which in MT LXX S T V reports the building of an altar after several episodes of the conquest (8:30–35), is located at an earlier place in the story in 4QJosh^{a}, before 5:1, immediately after the crossing of the Jordan, probably parallel to its position *apud* Josephus, *Ant.* V:16–19. According to Ulrich, the sequence of events in 4QJosh^{a}, which probably reflects the original shape of the story, shows that the Qumran text constituted a third formulation of Joshua, alongside MT S T V and LXX.[41] Furthermore, 4QJosh^{a} contains an occasionally shorter text similar to that of the LXX.[42]

---

[38] See chapter 6*, n. 12.

[39] See F. Dexinger, "Das Garizimgebot im Dekalog der Samaritaner," in *Studien zum Pentateuch Walter Kornfeld zum 60 Geburtstag* (ed. G. Braulik; Vienna/Freiburg/Basel: Herder, 1977) 111–33.

[40] See chapter 6*.

[41] E. Ulrich, "4QJoshua^{a} and Joshua's First Altar in the Promised Land," in Brooke–García Martínez, *New Qumran Texts*, 89–104. On the other hand, according to A. Rofé, "The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh^{a}," ibid., 73–80, the scroll displays a later, nomistic change of the MT sequence. For similar sequence differences in other passages, see Tov, *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 411–8. On the other hand, M.N. van der Meer, *Formation & Reformulation*

– 4QSam[a] probably reflects a different edition of the Song of Hannah from those reflected in MT and the LXX (see above). Many other details in this manuscript reflect a different, possibly older version of Samuel, but it is unclear to what extent it also reflects a redactionally earlier stage in these details. Some material may be midrashic (see the beginning of col. II), as suggested by Rofé[43] for the scroll as a whole.

– 4QJudg[a] lacks an entire section found in MT LXX S T V, viz., Judg 6:7–10. If this minus did not stem from a textual accident, such as the omission of a complete paragraph ending with open sections, it could reflect an earlier edition of the book, in which part of the deuteronomistic framework, contained in these verses, was lacking.[44]

– 1QIsa[a] 38:1–8. The different hands in chapter 38 in the scroll *may* reflect different stages of the development of 2 Kgs 20:1–11.[45]

– 4QRP, reclassified as a biblical manuscript, contains several long exegetical additions.[46]

– It is more difficult to categorize the evidence of other Qumran manuscripts, whose short or different text deviates from MT LXX S T V but is not related to the issue at stake because the compositions do not constitute biblical manuscripts in the usual sense of the word. The relevant evidence, relating to the short texts of 4QCant[a,b], 4QDeut[n], 4QDeut[j], 4QDeut[k1] (sections of Deuteronomy 5, 11, and 32) and other texts is described in chapter 4*. The Deuteronomy texts were probably liturgical excerpts. Likewise, several Psalms texts are considered by most

– *The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004) 511–9 claimed that the Qumran scroll does not reflect the sequence suggested in the scroll's edition in *DJD* XIV. In his view, part of the description of Josh 8:30–35 (viz., the reading of the Torah) was included in the story of crossing the Jordan at Gilgal in the scroll, and repeated *ad loc.* in 8:30–35 Another study that suggests literary differences between the various texts of Joshua is K. De Troyer, "Did Joshua Have a Crystal Ball? The Old Greek and the MT of Joshua 10:15, 17 and 23," in Paul*, Emanuel,* 571–89.

[42] Frgs. 15–16 of this scroll present a recensionally shorter text than MT that runs parallel to the shorter text of the LXX, although the two are not identical. Cf. Mazor, *Septuagint Translation*, 54–6 and eadem, "A Textual and Literary Study of the Fall of Ai in Joshua 8," in *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters, Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (ed. S. Japhet; Heb.; Jerusalem 1994) 73–108.

[43] A. Rofé, "The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and its Occurrence in *4QSam[a]*," *RevQ* 14 (1989) 247–54.

[44] See *TCHB*, 351 and J. Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants in 4QJudg[a] and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," *RevQ* 14 (1989) 229–45; idem, in *DJD* XIV, 161–9; N. Fernández Marcos, "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible,* 1–16. On the other hand, Rofé believes that the omission in the scroll was created by a scribal mistake (deletion of a paragraph), and that the relatively late scroll would not reflect such an early development: A. Rofé, "The Biblical Text in Light of Historico-Literary Criticism–The Reproach of the Prophet-Man in Judg 6:7–10 and 4QJudg[a]," in *Border Line*, 33–44.

[45] See *TCHB*, 346–8.

[46] See chapter 20*, § E and Tov, "Many Forms."

scholars to be non-biblical liturgical collections.[47] The Canticles manuscripts[48] are probably excerpted versions of the edition of MT LXX S T V.[49] The Qumran corpus also contains excerpted and abbreviated biblical manuscripts which were probably compiled for personal purposes: 4QExod^{d},[50] 4QDeut^{q} (Deut 32:37–43); 4QEzek^{b};[51] 1QPs^{a}, 4QPs^{g}, 4QPs^{h}, 5QPs all containing Psalm 119; 4QPs^{n} (135:6–8, 11–12; 136:23–24); 4QPs^{l} (Psalm 104); 4QDan^{e}.[52]

In short, probably only five or six biblical texts from Qumran, and none at all from the other sites in the Judaean Desert, provide *early* material relevant to the editorial development of the Hebrew Bible.[53]

The list of biblical Qumran texts attesting to early redactional stages different from MT LXX S T V is thus rather limited. Should we present a longer list, most additional items contributing to the literary analysis of the Bible will probably be conceived of as subsequent to the edition of MT LXX S T V. Consequently, according to this understanding, in addition to MT, the LXX remains the major source for recognizing different literary stages (early and late) of the Hebrew Bible.

4. Evaluation of the Literary Evidence of the LXX

Having reviewed the evidence of the LXX, other biblical versions, and the Qumran manuscripts, we note that beyond MT, the LXX preserves the greatest amount of information on different stages in the development of the Hebrew Bible, early and late.

When turning now to the background of this situation, we may not be able to explain the data. If we were groping in the dark in the earlier parts of this study, this section is even more hypothetical. Yet, if our assessment of the totality of the biblical evidence is correct, the assumption is unavoidable that the Hebrew manuscripts used for the Greek translation were important copies of the Hebrew Bible, since otherwise they would not have contained so much material which scholars consider relevant to the literary development of the biblical books. How should this phenomenon be explained?

---

[47] See chapter 4*.

[48] See *DJD* XVI, 195–219 and plates XXIV–XXV.

[49] On the other hand, E. Ulrich describes these texts as earlier than or parallel with MT: "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in Schiffman, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 51–9, esp. 57–8.

[50] See chapter 4*, § 2.

[51] See J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* XV, 216.

[52] See E. Ulrich, *DJD* XVI, 287.

[53] We exclude from this analysis the evidence of 4QTestimonia (4Q175) and the *tefillin*, even though they contain biblical passages. These texts were compiled on the basis of biblical texts for specific purposes, literary (4QTestimonia) and liturgical (*tefillin*).

The special character of the *Vorlage* of the LXX seems to be related to two factors or a combination of them: (1) the idiosyncratic Hebrew manuscripts used for the Greek translation were *not* embraced by the circles that fostered MT; and (2) the relatively early date of the translation enterprise (275–150 BCE), involving still earlier Hebrew manuscripts, could reflect vestiges of earlier editorial stages of the biblical books.[54] The earlier the date assigned to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, the more likely the text was to reflect early redactional stages of the biblical books. However, only a combination of the two factors explains that very old texts, such as probably reflected in the LXX, still circulated in the third-second centuries BCE, when some of the proto-Masoretic texts known to us already existed. This approach does not explain the cases in which the LXX presumably reflects editorial stages subsequent to MT. In these cases we have to appeal also to the special status of the *Vorlage* of the LXX in ancient Israel, in other words to its independence from the circles which embraced MT (factor 1).

When ascribing the idiosyncratic character of the Hebrew manuscripts included in the LXX to their early date, we find some support for this approach in the Qumran documents. A few early Qumran texts, similarly deriving from the third and second centuries BCE, reflect redactional differences from MT. Thus, two Qumran manuscripts contain the same early redactional stage as the LXX, namely 4QJer^{b} and 4QJer^{d} (both: 200–150 BCE), while 4QJosh^{a} is relatively early (150–50 BCE). At the same time, two other manuscripts *possibly* reflecting early literary stages are later: 4QJudg^{a} (50–25 BCE) and 4QSam^{a} (50–25 BCE). The evidence for Qumran is thus not clear-cut, but neither is it unequivocal for the LXX. For only some of the LXX books reflect redactionally different versions and by the same token only some of the early Qumran manuscripts are independent vis-à-vis MT. Nevertheless, the picture is rather clear. Among the eighteen Qumran manuscripts which were assigned by their editors to the same period as the LXX,[55] the two mentioned manuscripts of Jeremiah contain redactionally different elements, but the number of non-Masoretic manuscripts which are textually non-aligned in small details is very high.[56] Thus, according to our tentative working hypothesis, the early date of the Hebrew manuscripts used by the LXX translations in some books and of some of the Qumran manuscripts

[54] There is no evidence for the alternative assumption that the LXX was based on Hebrew texts of a local Egyptian vintage. If the Jewish population of Egypt hardly knew Hebrew, they would not have developed their own Hebrew version of the biblical text (*pace* the assumption of local texts as developed by Albright and Cross; see *TCHB*, 185–7).

[55] This information is based on B. Webster, "Chronological Indices of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," *DJD* XXXIX, 351–446.

[56] Of these eighteen manuscripts, seven are considered textually independent in small details: 4QExod^{d} (225–175 BCE), 4QDeut^{b} (150–100 BCE), 4QDeut^{c} (150–100 BCE), 5QDeut (200–150 BCE), 6QpapKings (150–100 BCE), 4QQoh^{a} (175–150 BCE), 4QXII^{a} (150–125 BCE), and one is close to SP: 4QExod-Lev^{f} (250 BCE). The others are either close to MT, or their textual affiliation cannot be determined.

may explain their attesting to early literary traditions. The assumption that the LXX was based on very ancient Hebrew manuscripts that were brought to Egypt in the fifth or fourth century would seem to provide an adequate explanation for the background of the LXX, but since we find redactionally early manuscripts from the second and first centuries BCE also in Qumran, that explanation need not be invoked.

A supplementary explanation of the special character of the LXX seems to be that the scrolls used for that translation came from circles different from the temple circles which supposedly fostered MT.[57] This argument pertaining to the textual situation at the time when manuscripts were selected for the Greek translation, is hypothetical with regard to the central position of MT in temple circles. However, the fact remains that none of the MT texts was used for the Greek translation.

While we cannot depict the early history of the biblical text on the basis of the limited evidence described so far, nevertheless an attempt will be made to illuminate a few shady areas.

It seems that most cases of different literary editions preserved in the textual witnesses reflect editorial developments in a linear way, one edition having been developed from an earlier one, preserved or not, while there also may have been intervening stages which have not been preserved. For example, the long editions of MT in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and 1 Samuel 16–18 probably developed from earlier shorter editions such as reflected in the LXX and 4QJer^{b,d}. In other cases the evidence is more complex, such as in Joshua where the LXX edition is both shorter, longer, and different in wording. However, in all these instances, a linear development between the LXX and MT editions *or vice versa* may be assumed, with the later edition mainly expanding the earlier one, while at times also shortening and changing its message.[58]

---

[57] Several statements in the rabbinic literature mention one or more master copies of the Torah in the temple, as well as limited textual activity, including correcting and revising (for some references, see *TCHB*, 32). Since the only text quoted in the rabbinic literature and used as the base for the Targumim and Vulgate is MT, it stands to reason that it was the text embraced by the rabbis. Furthermore, all the texts used by the religious zealots of Masada and the freedom fighters of Bar Kochba found at all other sites in the Judean Desert except for Qumran are identical to the medieval MT. These are probably the "corrected copies" mentioned in *b. Pesaḥ.* 112a, while the proto-Masoretic texts found at Qumran are one step removed from these "corrected texts." See chapter 12*.

[58] The alternative assumption of the existence of pristine parallel editions has been raised often in scholarship, but it seems that it cannot be supported by the preserved evidence, neither with regard to major variations, nor with regard to smaller ones. A possible exception would be the case of Proverbs, where two equally viable arrangements of the pericopes are reflected in the LXX and MT S T V. However, even this case does not necessarily prove the existence of early parallel editions. It only shows that scholars are often unable to decide which text developed from another one, while in reality one may have developed from the other.

Any reply to the question of why texts of the MT family were not used for the LXX translation remains a matter of conjecture. It probably seems rather unusual to us, having been exposed for two thousand years to the central position of MT, that MT was not used for this purpose. But in the reality of the third and second centuries BCE the non-use of MT was not unexpected. The realm of MT influence may have been limited to certain circles, and we do not know from which circles the Hebrew manuscripts used for the translation were sent or brought to Egypt. Clearly the circles or persons who sent or brought the manuscripts of the Torah to Alexandria were *not* Eleazar the High Priest and the sages, as narrated in the Epistle of Aristeas § 176. Any High Priest would undoubtedly have encouraged the use of MT for such an important enterprise. Incidentally, the Epistle of Aristeas praises the qualities of the translators as well as the external features of the scrolls, but says nothing about their content.

Our point of departure is that the proto-Masoretic copies existed already when the Greek translation was made. Several such copies were indeed found at Qumran. In the case of Jeremiah, the MT form is extant in 4QJer^{a}, which is dated around 200 BCE. Why then was a copy of the tradition of 4QJer^{b,d} used for the LXX, and not its MT counterpart? Was it preferred to MT because it was considered more ancient (which it really was, in our view) or more authentic? Was that text possibly accepted by specific circles as opposed to the MT version adopted in the temple circles? The text used for the LXX was a good one, as opposed to many of the carelessly written copies found at Qumran. It was not one of the Palestinian "vulgar" copies involving much secondary editing such as the SP group.[59] But it remains difficult to determine the background of this text. At the same time, the choice of certain texts for the Greek translation could not have been coincidental. After all, the LXX contains important early and independent material.

The evidence discussed in the anthology *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible* represents only some of the literary material reflected in the LXX. One should therefore consider the totality of the LXX evidence. It would be one-sided to consider only chronological factors, as was done in several studies which suggest a Maccabean date for elements in MT, thus explaining the background of the various redactional stages as chronologically different. However, at the time of the translation, ancient copies still circulated, while the edition of MT had already incorporated editorial stages meant to replace these earlier texts. The assumption of a Maccabean date of MT would explain several cases in which the LXX antedated MT, but that solution seems to be unrealistic since several early (pre-Maccabean) MT manuscripts are known from Qumran. Nevertheless, such a late date has been suggested for several biblical books or parts of them,

[59] Nevertheless, the Greek Torah contains a fair number of harmonizing readings in *small* details, almost as many as the SP group; see chapter 19*.

especially Psalms, without reference to the LXX.[60] As for the LXX, on the basis of a single reading and a small group of readings, Schenker dated the MT edition of 1–2 Kings to the period between 250 and 130 BCE, probably closer to the later end of this spectrum (see n. 14). According to Schenker, an equally late revision is found in MT of 1 Kings 20:10–20.[61] Likewise, Lust dated the MT edition of Ezekiel to the second century BCE, the time of Jonathan Maccabee.[62] Böhler notes that the list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem in the edition of MT in Nehemiah 11 reflects the reality of the Maccabean times with regard to the scope of Judea.[63] Likewise, in the case of the MT version of Joshua 20 differing redactionally from the LXX, Wellhausen and Cooke suggested that the MT redaction was created after the time of the LXX.[64]

While not trying to refute these specific "Maccabean" arguments in detail, it seems that the basis for the Maccabean dating of MT is one-sided, and that several details are debatable. At least in the case of Jeremiah the chronological argument does not hold, and furthermore one should be attentive to the textual forces in ancient Israel in the third-second centuries BCE. At that time, the MT manuscripts were embraced by certain circles only, while others used different, often older, manuscripts.[65]

---

[60] For a discussion, see R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart/Berlin/Cologne/Mainz: Kohlhammer, 1978) 192–3.

[61] Those verses mention groups of dancing men as well as King David's dances. These elements suited the Hellenistic culture, and were therefore omitted in MT, according to Schenker, probably in the second century BCE.

[62] "Ezekiel 4 and 5 in Hebrew and in Greek," *ETL* 77 (2001) 132–52 (132–5). Lust's point of departure is a comparison of the 390 years of punishment of MT in Ezek 4:4–6 (actually 390 + 40 = 430) and the 190 years of the LXX (= 150 years for the iniquity of Israel [v 4] + 40 for that of Judah). Lust considers the figure of 190 of the LXX as more original, while the 390 years of MT show its late date. According to the edition of MT, if the 390 years are to be calculated from the date of the destruction of the first temple, together with the mentioned 40 years, we arrive at 157/156 BCE, during the era of Jonathan Maccabee. Lust does not explain the exact relation between the figures of MT and the LXX.

[63] D. Böhler, "On the Relationship between Textual and Literary Criticism – The Two Recensions of the Book of Ezra: Ezra-Neh (MT) and 1 Esdras (LXX)," in *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible*, 35–50 (48).

[64] J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963) 132; G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Joshua* (Cambridge: University Press, 1918) *ad loc.* See also A. Rofé, "Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated," in Tigay, *Empirical Models,* 131–47, esp. 145.

[65] My own intuition tells me that more often than not the LXX reflects an earlier stage than MT both in the literary shape of the biblical books and in small details. Thus also Barthélemy, "L'enchevêtrement," 39: "Souvent cet état [*scil.* … littéraire autonome et distinct du TM] est plus ancien que celui qu'offre le TM. Parfois il est plus récent. Mais cela ne saurait amener à préférer l'un à l'autre. LXX et TM méritent d'être traités comme deux formes bibliques traditionelles dont chacune doit être interprétée pour elle-même."

5. Conclusions

a. An open approach was advocated in the discussion of the large-scale differences between MT S T V and the LXX, involving both Greek segments which presumably preceded the literary stage included in MT and those which were created subsequently. It was found that a substantive number of such differences preceded the MT edition.

b. When comparing the LXX evidence with that of the other sources, we found that beyond MT, the LXX is the single most important source preserving redactionally different material relevant to the literary analysis of the Bible, often earlier than MT. The other biblical translations preserve no such material, while a limited amount of redactionally different material has been preserved in some Hebrew biblical texts from Qumran, especially in early texts.

c. The preservation of redactionally different material in the LXX was ascribed to two factors or a combination of them: (1) the idiosyncratic nature of the Hebrew manuscripts used for the translation not shared by the circles which embraced MT; and (2) the relatively early date of the translation enterprise (275–150 BCE), involving still earlier Hebrew manuscripts which could reflect vestiges of earlier editorial stages of the biblical books. These factors may explain the special nature of the LXX in different ways, but sometimes they need to be combined. For example, the texts that circulated at the time of the Greek translation beyond the circles which embraced MT may have contained very early elements.

d. In view of the above, I allow myself to retain reservations regarding the possibility of a Maccabean date for details in MT. Such a dating is based only on the chronological argument, and not on recognition of the textual situation in ancient Israel, where early texts could have been circulating for decades or centuries outside the temple circles.

Chapter Twelve

The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues

I. Hebrew/Aramaic Texts

This study focuses on the biblical texts used in the ancient synagogues in the original languages and in Greek translation. We are faced with enigmas at all levels because of our fragmentary information regarding the ancient synagogues[1] – their social, religious, and physical structure – let alone the text of the Bible used in these institutions. Since the data regarding the institutions is insufficient, it would therefore appear that inadequate evidence is available for an analysis of the topic under investigation, and that we would have to learn from inference only, especially from rabbinic and other sources with regard to the reading from the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bibles. However, this is one of those fortuitous situations in which archeology comes to our aid, since two biblical scrolls were found at the site of a synagogue, namely under the floor of the Masada synagogue.[2] We are even more fortunate, since it appears that the evidence unearthed at Masada corroborates other archeological and literary evidence regarding the use of biblical texts. We first turn to the evidence from Masada, and afterwards to some general observations about the use of Scripture in the original languages.

---

[1] See especially the questions raised by L. I. Levine, "The First-Century Synagogue, New Perspectives," STK 77 (2001) 22–30 and idem, *The Ancient Synagogue.*

[2] The burned remains of scrolls in the Ein Geddi synagogue derive from a later period (probably 250–300 CE); see the description by D. Barag in *The New Encyclopedia of the Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. E. Stern; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Ministry of Defense, Carta, 1992) 1200 (with bibliography). The definition of the early synagogue is *not* expanded to include houses of prayer in general, so that the buildings of the Qumran community are excluded from the analysis. While it is unknown where in Qumran communal prayers took place, such prayers were held in Qumran and Scripture was read at such occasions. However, we have no way to know which of the Scripture texts found in Qumran was read at such occasions. See further below. On the other hand, Binder's detailed analysis suggests that Qumran may be considered a synagogue, in the main because the holy places of the Essenes (not necessarily that of the Qumran community!) were called *synagogai* by Philo, *Prob.* 80–83, and because he identified certain *loci* as rooms for communal prayers. See D. D. Binder, *Into the Temple Courts – The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* (SBLDS 169; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999) 453–68.

1. The Evidence from Masada

Two scrolls were found under the floor of the Zealot synagogue (room 1043):

MasDeut (1043/1–4) [Mas 1c]

MasEzek (1043–2220) [Mas 1d]

The archeological evidence is described by Yadin, who noted that the scrolls were found in two pits carefully dug under the floor of the synagogue. The scrolls were deposited at the bottom of the pits which afterwards were filled with earth and stones.[3] A more detailed description is provided by Netzer.[4] The scrolls were buried under the ground, and hence most scholars presume this burial to be sound evidence for the practice of a *genizah*. However, Thiede suggested that at an earlier stage the scrolls were located in a room behind the *'aron ha-qodesh*,[5] and that "when the Romans approached, the scrolls were hastily buried under the floor, and when the Romans arrived and found the synagogue, they burnt furniture and other objects and threw them into that room." Although the details in this description may be hypothetical, it is not impossible that the burial does not necessarily point to a *genizah*, and that the scrolls were indeed buried for safekeeping against destruction by the Romans. In any event, the assumption that this was a *genizah* is not crucial to our analysis of the texts, and it is more important to stress that the building was a synagogue.

Beyond these considerations, the only solid piece of evidence concerning the Masada fragments is that two scrolls of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel were buried under the floor of the synagogue. Why these specific scrolls, and not others, were buried there remains unknown since only fragments of the scrolls have been preserved. Possibly these scrolls, or segments of them, were damaged at an earlier stage or were otherwise deemed unfit for public reading, rendering their religious storage in a special burial place (*genizah*) mandatory. The Zealots probably buried these scrolls during their sojourn at Masada (thus providing us with a *terminus ante quem* for the copying and storage, namely 73 CE). The burial in separate pits probably shows that the scrolls were discarded at different times. Note that the scrolls probably represented two individual books, and were not segments of larger scrolls. That is, the Deuteronomy scroll probably was not part of a larger Torah scroll, and the Ezekiel scroll did not contain all of the Later Prophets. If the scrolls had been larger, it is probable that some additional fragments would have been preserved.[6] The Deuteronomy scroll contains the very end of the book (Deut 32:46–47; 33:17–24; 34:2–6), as well as an attached unin-

[3] Y. Yadin, *Masada, Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (London: Weidenfeld and Nickolson, 1966) 187.

[4] E. Netzer, *Masada III,* 407 ff.

[5] C. P. Thiede, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (Oxford: Lion Publications, 2000) 74.

[6] Several *haftarot* are read from Ezekiel, but the burying of an Ezekiel scroll under the floor in the Masada synagogue is not necessarily connected to the reading cycle.

scribed handle sheet, and it is not impossible that the last sheet(s) were damaged due to excessive use (cf. the re-inking of the last column of 1QIsa[a]), and hence was/were placed in storage without the remainder of the book.

The two scrolls found in an ancient synagogue provide some information about texts used in that institution. It would be unusual to assume that these scrolls were not used in the synagogue itself, and had only been brought there in order to be buried. Such an assumption could be made about a larger community such as a city, but would not be in order for Masada. The following details are known about the contents and other features of the scrolls found under the synagogue at Masada:

a. The text of the two scrolls is identical to that of the medieval MT, and much closer to the medieval text than the proto-Masoretic Qumran scrolls.[7] This feature pertains also to the other five biblical scrolls found elsewhere at three different locations at Masada. The scrolls differ from the medieval manuscripts no more than the latter differ among themselves.

b. With regard to their physical features, the two Masada scrolls were probably luxury scrolls.[8] The main distinguishing features of luxury scrolls are their large top and bottom margins, always more than 3.0 cm, and sometimes extending to 5.0, 6.0, or 7.0 cm. Thus the top margin of the Ezekiel scroll measures 3.0 cm, while that of the Deuteronomy scroll is 3.4 cm. Also the only other Masada scroll for which these data are known, MasPs[a], has a top margin of 2.4 cm and a bottom margin of 3.0 cm. Luxury scrolls also usually have a large number of lines, 42 in the cases of MasDeut and MasEzek, and 29 in the case of MasPs[a].

c. As a rule, *de luxe* scrolls are characterized by a small degree of scribal intervention, as may be expected from scrolls that usually were carefully written. The fewer mistakes that are made, the fewer the corrections needed. However, scribal intervention pertains not only to the correction of mistakes, but also to the insertion of scribal changes. The number of scribal interventions in MasEzek is one per 18 lines, in MasDeut one per 17 lines, and in MasPs[a] one per 85 lines.[9]

In all three criteria, the characteristics of the luxury biblical scrolls have been prescribed in rabbinic literature for the copying of Scripture scrolls, with regard to the size of the top and bottom margins,[10] the paucity of scribal intervention,[11] and precision in the copying (see below).

At the beginning of this study, attention was drawn to the physical evidence for specific biblical scrolls found in a synagogue environment. We now turn to

---

[7] For a detailed analysis of the Masada texts, see S. Talmon in *Masada VI*, 149; E. Tov, "A Qumran Origin for the Masada Non-biblical Texts?" *DSD* 7 (2000) 57–73, especially the Appendix.

[8] See chapter 10*, § 3 and *Scribal Practices*, 125–9.

[9] See chapter 9, § 3 and chapter 10, § 3.

[10] See *Scribal Practices*, 125–9.

[11] See *Scribal Practices*, ibid.

the other archeological and literary evidence for the use of specific biblical texts in the synagogue. We will not dwell on the more general question of evidence for reading from Scripture in the original languages, Hebrew and Aramaic, in religious gatherings. It seems to us that this question has been sufficiently treated, especially in a study by Schiffman,[12] and previously also by Perrot,[13] Levine,[14] and Safrai, the latter with regard to rabbinic sources.[15] Passages in Philo, Josephus,[16] and the NT (Luke 4:16–21; Acts 15:21; 17:1) refer to the regular reading of Scripture in synagogues in the original languages as well as in translation. The reading from the Torah in a religious gathering is mentioned also in the writings of the Qumran community. It is unknown how this reading took place, but 4QDamascus Document clearly refers to the public reading from Scripture[17] and 4QHalakha A (4Q251) 1 5 mentions such reading on the Sabbath, while 1QS VI 6–8 is less specific.[18] That scrolls were stored in the synagogue, first in an adjacent room and later in a special niche or in an *'aron ha-qodesh*, is established by an early source such as Luke 4:16–21. According to these verses, Jesus entered the synagogue in Nazareth, a scroll of Isaiah was handed to him, unrolled it, read the text, and rolled the scroll back after use.[19] Storage of such scrolls in the synagogue is also mentioned in rabbinic literature[20] and is established for several synagogues

[12] L. Schiffman, "The Early History of Public Reading of the Torah," in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue – Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period* (ed. S. Fine; London/New York: Routledge, 1999) 44–56.

[13] C. Perrot, "The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue," in *Mikra*, 137–59; idem, "Luc 4:16–30 et la lecture biblique dans l'ancienne synagogue," in *Exégèse biblique et Judaisme* (ed. J. E. Ménard; Strasbourg, 1973) 170–86.

[14] L. I. Levine, "The Development of Synagogue Liturgy in Late Antiquity," in *Galilee through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures* (ed. E. M. Meyers; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1999) 123–44; idem, *The Ancient Synagogue*, 135–43.

[15] S. Safrai, *The Jewish People in the First Century – Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern; CRINT, Section One, Volume Two; Assen–Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1976) 908–44, 945–70. For the reading cycles, see especially J. Mann and I. Sonne, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue: A Study in the Cycles of the Readings from Torah and Prophets*, vols. 1–2 (Cincinnati: Mann-Sonne Publ. Committee, 1940–1966).

[16] For both authors, see the analysis by Schiffman, "Early History," 46–8 (n. 12 above).

[17] The combination of several fragments of parallel manuscripts, as reconstructed by J. M. Baumgarten, *DJD* XVIII provides the full picture. See 4QD^{a} (4Q266) 5 ii 1–3, 4QD^{b} (4Q267) 5 ii 3–5, 4QpapD^{h} (4Q273) 2 1 and the analysis of Schiffman, "Early History," 45–6.

[18] For an analysis, see M. Fishbane, "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran," *Mikra*, 339–77.

[19] From several ancient sources it is also evident that synagogues contained a collection of Scripture scrolls in a special place (*'aron ha-qodesh*), while the name "library" would probably be a little exaggerated for such a collection. Likewise, the implication of Acts 17:10–11 is that Scripture scrolls were stored in the synagogue. *Y. Meg.* 3:73d specifically mentions the keeping of separate scrolls of the Torah, Prophets, and Hagiographa in synagogues.

[20] See Safrai, *The Jewish People*, esp. 927–33, 940 (see n. 15 above).

starting with the synagogue of Dura Europos in the mid-second century CE and that of Khirbet Shema in the mid-third century.[21]

2. Indirect Evidence about Specific Texts Used in the Synagogue

The two scrolls found under the floor of the synagogue at Masada are identical to the medieval MT, and hence were forerunners of that text. The external features of these scrolls are those of luxury editions. When assessing now the other manuscript finds from the Judean Desert together with some literary evidence, we will better understand the textual situation in Israel around the turn of the era.

The only location at which ancient Hebrew and Aramaic scrolls have been found in Israel is the Judean Desert. This is a small region, but we believe that the corpora found there include texts deriving from other places within Israel, thus presenting us with a clear picture of the texts used in the whole country, even though a judgment on the origin of each individual scroll remains hypothetical. Some of the Qumran scrolls were close to the medieval MT, although almost never as close as the scrolls from the other sites in the Judean Desert. These proto-Masoretic scrolls, forming the largest group at Qumran, must have been based on the texts that were identical to the medieval text such as found at Masada and other sites. Of the other texts found at Qumran, some had close connections to the Hebrew source of the LXX, while others were of the "vulgar" type, often written in a very free orthography and often freely editing the biblical text. As far as we know, none of these groups of texts had a close connection to the texts used in the synagogue. Nor did the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX derive from temple circles, even though the Epistle of Aristeas § 176 stated that Eleazar the High Priest himself sent the Torah scroll to Egypt for the purpose of translation.

The texts that are relevant to the present analysis are those that are close to the medieval MT. It is strange that a discussion of ancient texts resorts to medieval sources, but the nature of the medieval copies helps us in the characterization of the ancient texts. Focusing on the consonantal framework of the medieval text, MT, and disregarding the medieval elements of that text (vowels, accents, Masorah), we note that MT was the only one used in earlier centuries in rabbinic circles. This is the only text that is quoted in rabbinic literature, and is used for the various targumim. Also, the extra-textual details of MT discussed in rabbinic literature, such as the open and closed sections, scribal notations, versification, as well as reading from Scripture, refer exactly to this text. It is therefore assumed that the text that was carefully transmitted through the centuries was previously embraced by rabbinic circles. We would even go so far as to assume that these

[21] For the evidence and an analysis, see E. M. Meyers, "The Torah Shrine in the Ancient Synagogue," in *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists*, 201–23 (see n. 12 above).

texts were based on the scroll found in the temple court, but more on this below. First we focus on the evidence from the Judean Desert.

The texts from sites other than Qumran published in the 1990s together with Murabba'at texts edited in *DJD* II,[22] show beyond doubt that we should posit two types of Masoretic scrolls, an inner circle of proto-rabbinic scrolls that agree precisely with codex L and a second circle of scrolls that are very similar to it. (Codex L [Leningrad codex $B19^A$] is chosen as the best complete representative of the medieval text.) Most scrolls found at Qumran belong to this second circle, with only a few texts belonging to the first group.[23] On the other hand, *all* the scrolls found at sites in the Judean Desert other than Qumran belong to the inner circle of proto-rabbinic scrolls. Thus, the 23 texts that were found at these sites[24] agree with L to such an extent that they are actually identical with that manuscript. The only differences between the proto-Masoretic scrolls from various sites in the Judean Desert and L pertain to a few details in orthography, minute details in content, paragraphing, and the layout of some individual Psalms. At the same time, these texts always agree with L against the LXX.

The differences between these scrolls and L are negligible, and in fact their nature resembles the internal differences between the medieval manuscripts themselves. Accordingly, the small degree of divergence between L and texts from the Judean Desert, mainly the texts outside Qumran, allows us to regard these texts as belonging to the same group, or in our terminology, the inner circle of proto-rabbinic texts.[25] This inner circle contained the consonantal framework of MT one thousand years or more before the time of the Masorah codices. This applies also to the second circle of Masoretic texts.

The texts of the inner circle of proto-rabbinic texts are usually written in *de luxe* editions, and they display very little or no scribal intervention. In both parameters, these texts follow the instructions given in rabbinic literature.

The second circle of ancient scrolls is that of most proto-Masoretic texts found at Qumran. These scrolls deviate more from L than the scrolls of the first circle, they are less precise, reflect more scribal intervention, and usually are not written in *de luxe* editions.

We now turn to some thoughts concerning the background of the two groups of scrolls, trying to connect them to data known from rabbinic sources.

---

[22] For a list of the publications of all the biblical texts, see chapter 10*, § 1.

[23] See chapter 4*, § B.

[24] For a list, see chapter 10*, § A.

[25] Some medieval manuscripts are almost identical to one another in their consonantal text, such as L and the Aleppo Codex. However, other codices from Leningrad and elsewhere are more widely divergent from these two choice manuscripts. Thus the degree of divergence between the Tiberian and Babylonian codices resembles that between the Judean Desert scrolls and any medieval source. Young, "Stabilization" provides statistics that highlight the large amount of agreement between the medieval manuscripts of MT and the Masada manuscripts as opposed to a smaller amount of such agreement with the proto-MT scrolls from Qumran.

The text which is traditionally known as the medieval MT, and earlier representations of which were found in the Judean Desert, was embraced by the spiritual leadership of Jerusalem. It is therefore often called the "proto-rabbinic"[26] or "proto-Masoretic" Text.

All the copies of the proto-rabbinic group of texts such as those found at all sites in the Judean Desert excluding Qumran were to all intents and purposes identical, or at least an attempt was made to make them so as shown by the precision in copying.[27]

In retrospect, it was probably to be expected that the people who left the Hebrew scrolls behind in the Judean Desert possessed biblical scrolls that closely reflected the instructions of the Jerusalem spiritual center for the writing of Scripture scrolls. This characterization which applies to the rebels of Masada and the freedom fighters of Bar Kochba was stressed in 1956 by Greenberg for the texts from Murabba'at on the basis of the scanty evidence then available: "… since the spiritual leaders of this Second Revolt against Rome (132–135) were some of the most eminent Rabbis, there is no question as to the orthodoxy of this group."[28] Some scholars even stress the priestly influence on the leadership of the revolt.[29]

To find ancient and medieval identical textual evidence is not very common, but it represents an unusual situation requiring explanation. We therefore turn to the question of how such textual identity was achieved, among the scrolls from the Judean Desert internally, between these scrolls and the temple copies, and these scrolls and the medieval manuscripts. The logic prevailing today could not have been different from that of ancient times. It seems to us that identity between two or more texts could have been achieved only *if all of them were copied from a single source, in this case (a) master copy (copies)* located in a central place, until 70 CE probably in the temple, and subsequently in another central place (Jamnia?). The textual unity described above has to start somewhere and the assumption of master copies is therefore necessary.[30] The depositing and preserving of holy books in the temple is parallel to the modern concept of publication as

---

[26] See chapter 10*, n. 57.

[27] The agreements of these ancient scrolls with L pertain to the smallest details. Thus the agreement between MasLev^{b} and the medieval text pertains even to the intricacies of orthography, including details in which the orthography *ad loc.* goes against the conventions elsewhere in the book such as the defective תמי[מם in Lev 9:2, 3 (col. I 11, 13) and the defective *hiph'il* form ויקרבו in Lev 9:9 (col. I 21). This has been pointed out in detail by Talmon in his edition of these texts (see n. 7).

[28] M. Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible," *JAOS* 76 (1956) 157–67, esp. 165.

[29] See D. Goodblatt, "The Title *Nasi*' and the Ideological Background of the Second Revolt," in *The Bar Kokhva Revolt – A New Approach* (ed. A. Oppenheimer and U. Rappaport; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi, 1984) 113–32.

[30] This suggestion was already voiced by Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, III.171 and Lieberman, *Hellenism*, 22.

implied by various references in rabbinic literature,[31] and can be paralleled by evidence from ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome.[32]

This is a mere hypothesis, but hopefully we found a missing link by reinterpreting passages in rabbinic literature referring to ancient copies. Rabbinic sources deriving from a period later than the Judean Desert evidence provide descriptions of earlier textual procedures, which were partly also their own. In these descriptions we read about a master copy of the Torah found in the temple court, and about scrolls copied from or revised according to that copy. The term *sefer ha-ʿazara* (ספר העזרה, with a variant ספר עזרא, the book of Ezra)[33] probably referred only to the Torah,[34] but it stands to reason that the other Scripture books were also found in the temple. Thus, according to *m. Yom*. 1.6 the elders of the priesthood read to the High Priest on the eve of the Day of Atonement from Job, Ezra, Chronicles, and Daniel.[35] Incidentally, rabbinic literature usually speaks of a single scroll of the Torah in the temple court, while a *baraita* mentions the three scrolls found in the temple,[36] but even this source implies the creation of a single source on the basis of the majority readings among the three scrolls, each time involving a different type of majority.[37] These Scripture

[31] Thus Lieberman, *Hellenism*, 85–7; M. Kister, "In the Margin of Ben-Sira," *Leshonenu* 47 (1982–1983) 134–5 (Heb.); M. A. Friedman, "Publication of a Book by Depositing it in a Sanctuary: On the Phrase 'Written and Deposited'," *Leshonenu* 48–49 (1983–1984) 49–52 (Heb.); M. Kister, "Additions to the Article בשולי ספר בן סירא," *Leshonenu* 53 (1988–1989) 36–53 (Heb.). The Talmudic phrase used for this action is כתוב ומונח and similar phrases, for which cf. also the terms used by Josephus as quoted below. The parallels adduced by Friedman include references to the temple and the עזרה.

[32] See J. Leipoldt and S. Morenz, *Heilige Schriften – Betrachtungen zur Religionsgeschichte der antiken Mittelmeerwelt* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1953) 89–91, 165–71; Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 80–86; M. Haran, "Scribal Workmanship in Biblical Times – The Scrolls and the Writing Implements," *Tarbiz* 50 (1980–1981) 70–71 (Heb.). These parallels in external sources were stressed much in Kutscher's argumentation in favor of the assumption of master scrolls in the temple: Kutscher, *Language*, 82.

[33] See *m. Kel.* 15.6; *m. Moed Qatan* 3.4; *b. b. Bat.* 14b; *b. Yoma* 69a–b; *y. San.* 2.20c. This variant, occurring among other things in *m. Moed Qatan*, is considered the original reading by Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 84, 102.

[34] This is evident from the discussion in *b. b. Bat.* 14b and from the names of the three scrolls found in the temple court relating to passages in the Torah (see the next note).

[35] Josephus speaks three times of ancient writings "laid up/deposited" in the temple (*Ant.* III 38 and similarly elsewhere), referring to pericopes in Exodus, Deuteronomy, and Joshua. However, *pace* Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 84 it seems that Josephus did not refer to the biblical books, but to additional ancient writings. See *Ant.* III 38 (Exod 17:6), IV 302–304 (Deuteronomy 32) and V 61 (Josh 10:12–14).

[36] See *y. Taʿan.* 4.68a (cf. *Sof* 6.4 and Abot de R. Nathan B chapter 46). For a thorough analysis, see S. Talmon, "The Three Scrolls of the Law That Were Found in the Temple Court," *Textus* 2 (1962) 14–27. Earlier studies are: J. Z. Lauterbach, "The Three Books Found in the Temple at Jerusalem," *JQR* 8 (1917–1918) 385–423; S. Zeitlin, "Were There Three Torah-Scrolls in the Azarah?" *JQR* 56 (1966) 269–72. Both studies were reprinted in *The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible – An Introductory Reader* (ed. S. Z. Leiman; New York: Ktav, 1974).

[37] The problems of the unclear depiction of the procedures followed were discussed at length by Talmon (see previous note) within the framework of his own explanations.

books, together with the master copy of the Torah were probably part of a temple library.[38] It should be admitted that the evidence for the existence of the books of the Prophets and Hagiographa in the temple is based on limited evidence, more so on inference relating to the unified textual tradition of these books. Little is known about these temple scrolls,[39] and they cannot be dated.[40] Nevertheless, the little that is known about them is consonant with the texts from the Judean Desert (except for Qumran). We suggest that the internal identity of this group of texts, subsequently perpetuated in the medieval tradition,[41] was created because they were copied from or revised according to the master copies in the temple. It also seems that the type of scrolls found in the Judean Desert[42] is referred to in rabbinic literature.

We surmise that a carefully copied biblical text such as found in the Judean Desert is mentioned in rabbinic literature as a "corrected scroll," *sefer muggah*.[43] The temple employed professional *maggihim*, "correctors" or "revisers," whose task it was to safeguard precision in the copying of the text: "*Maggihim* of books in Jerusalem received their fees from the temple funds" (*b. Ketub.* 106a).[44] This description implies that the correcting procedure based on the master copy in the temple was financed from the temple resources which thus provided an *imprimatur*. This was the only way to safeguard the proper distribution of precise copies

[38] Thus already Blau, *Studien*, 110–11. The founding of such a library by Nehemiah was mentioned in 2 Macc 2:13–15 ("books concerning kings, prophets, David, and royal letters"). Josephus mentions a temple library on various occasions (e. g., *Ant.* III 38; IV 303; V 61), among other things with regard to the copy of the Jewish Law taken as spoil by Titus (*B. J.* VII 150, 162). For further references and an analysis, see A. F. J. Klijn, "A Library of Scriptures in Jerusalem?" *TU* 124 (1977) 265–72.

[39] Gordis, *Biblical Text,* xl, on the other hand, assumes that "anonymous scholars" chose a precise manuscript and deposited it in the temple "between the accession of Simon the Maccabean (142 B.C.E.) and the destruction of the Temple (70 C.E.)."

[40] The fact that the spelling and language of the Torah and Former Prophets were not modernized when at later times new practices were in vogue, as witnessed by parallel segments in Chronicles, may be used as proof that the exact shape of the Torah and Former Prophets was not changed after the time of the Chronicler. A case in point may be the name of Jerusalem, written without a *yod* in the early books and four times with a *yod* in Chronicles, once in Jeremiah and once in Esther, and thus as a rule in the nonbiblical Qumran scrolls. Nevertheless, the spelling of the earlier books was not modernized. See Kutscher, *Language,* 5.

[41] This point was stressed by Gordis, *Biblical Text,* xxvii who suggested that "it, therefore, seems reasonable to identify the ספר העורה (or ספר עורא) with the ancient, highly regarded manuscript which became the archetype for all accurate codices."

[42] It is not impossible that these texts were official texts, possibly from synagogues, brought by fugitives to the Judean Desert during the first and second revolt (I owe this suggestion to R. Deines, Tübingen).

[43] For an initial analysis of the *sefer muggah*, see Blau, *Studien,* 97–111; Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, III.170–71.

[44] מגיהי ספרים בירושלים היו נוטלין שכרן מתרומת הלשכה. *Y. Sheq.* 4.48a has an interesting variant to this text, viz. מגיהי ספר העזרה היו נוטלין שכרן מתרומה הלשכה, which should probably be translated as "the revisers of <Bible scrolls according to> the scroll of the temple court …" (similarly Gordis, *Biblical Text*, xxvii).

of Scripture. Safrai even suggests that the pilgrims who came to Jerusalem had their biblical texts corrected by the temple scribes.[45] These scrolls must have been used everywhere in Israel,[46] for public reading as well as for instruction, public and private, as suggested by *b. Pesaḥ.* 112a, where one of the five items R. Akiba urged his student R. Simeon was: "and when you teach your son, teach him from a corrected scroll." Another such precise copy was the scroll of the king, which accompanied the king everywhere. *y. San.* 2.20c and Sifre Deuteronomy 160[47] tell us that this scroll was corrected "from to the copy in the temple court in accordance with the court of seventy-one members."[48] At the same time, *b. Ketub.* 19b mentions a *sefer she'ênо muggah*, "a book that is not corrected" which one could not have in his house any longer than thirty days.[49]

On purely abstract grounds it was suggested above that textual identity could have been achieved only by copying from a single source, and such a procedure is actually mentioned in rabbinic literature. The copying from or correcting according to a master copy ensured that its text was perpetuated in the precise copies used everywhere in Israel, among other things in the Judean Desert texts, in quotations in rabbinic literature, most Targumim, and subsequently in the medieval Masoretic manuscripts. It is therefore suggested *to identify the precise proto-Masoretic texts found in the Judean Desert as some of the "corrected scrolls"* mentioned in rabbinic literature.

The various pieces of this description are supported by negative and positive evidence at Qumran: the assumed "corrected copies" were found at various places in the Judean Desert, but not at Qumran. The Qumranites were not bound by the copying practices of the temple circles, as is clear not only from the absence of these copies from Qumran, but also from the textual variety and a large number of corrections and new orthographical and morphological practices reflected in

[45] S. Safrai, *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple* (Heb.; Tel Aviv: Am Hassefer, 1965) 203 = idem, *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (Forschungen zum Jüdisch-Christlichen Dialog 3; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1985) 262. Safrai's views are based upon *m. Mo'ed Qatan* 3.4 according to Rashi's interpretation ("on the middle days of the three *regalim* one is not allowed to correct even one single letter, not even from the scroll in the temple court").

[46] Similarly S. Safrai in Safrai, *The Jewish People* [see n. 15] 905: "Problems related to the transmission of the text and authenticity of various books of the Bible were examined in the Temple; copyists and correctors sat in the Temple and worked to supply books to *those who needed them in the land of Israel and in the Diaspora* <my italics, E. T.>. There was a bible in the Temple called 'the book of the court' on the basis of which books were corrected."

[47] Ed. Finkelstein (New York/Jerusalem: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1993) 211. The complicated description of the correcting procedure in *t. San.* 4.7 is probably based on the wording in *y. San.*

[48] In another context, we read in *y. Ket.* 2.26b: "a corrected scroll like those which are designated as the books of Assi." Lieberman, *Hellenism*, 25 adds: "From the context it is obvious that these corrected books were written by Assi himself whose handwriting was well known." For a discussion of the scroll of the king, see Blau, *Studien*, 106–7.

[49] Interestingly enough, Rashi explains this book as not only containing the Torah, but any part of Scripture.

the Qumran texts probably produced by a scribal school active in Qumran and other places. At the same time, a sizeable number of a second circle of proto-MT texts like 1QIsa[a], 4QSam[b], 4QJer[a], 4QJer[c] was found at Qumran. These scrolls resemble the nature of the "corrected copies" with regard to their closeness to the medieval MT, but they are less precise. Possibly they were copied from the "corrected copies," probably not in Qumran.[50]

In our description of the temple practices, we do not know when copies were first deposited in the temple and when they became model copies.[51] One possibility would be that as late as the early Hasmonean period a master copy was instituted in the temple court because of the extant textual plurality, but neither an early nor a late date can be supported convincingly. Also the opposite idea that the master copy resulted from a procedure of standardization cannot be supported either, not only because in our view such a conscious procedure never took place,[52] but also because different Bible texts continued to coexist with the master codex. Over the course of a long time there must have been an approach of textual rigidity in the temple and its circle of influence, while in other circles textual freedom was the rule.

Central to our description is the idea that the temple had sufficient authority over parts of the population to impose upon them a specific form of the Bible text. This authority did not pertain to all of Israel, for other texts continued to be in use. These texts, such as ancient texts similar to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, a group of texts similar to the SP, and imprecise texts such as the Torah of Rabbi Meir and several Qumran texts, circulated alongside the corrected copies.

Like Lieberman, we assign a central task to the temple in the diffusion of corrected copies of Scripture. But in our model, one central text was in the temple, and the corrected copies circulated in Israel, while according to Lieberman the precise copies as a group were located in the temple. Lieberman's model, written before the scrolls were known, is discussed here briefly as it has been influential

---

[50] The approach of the Qumranites towards the textual diversity represented by the finds in the caves is unknown, but it seems that such diversity was probably disregarded by them. See chapter 10*. One could surmise that Qumran texts of the best quality were used in religious gatherings, while all other texts were used for different purposes, but this distinction is not supported by any evidence.

[51] It is unclear when a copy of the Torah is first attested to in the temple. Blau, *Studien*, 99 goes back as far as the period of Hezekiah when according to 2 Chr 19:8 a copy of the Torah guided priests, Levites, and others. However, for this early period the evidence is unclear, while it is more stable for the period of Josiah when according to 2 Kings 22 and 2 Chronicles 34 a book of the Torah was found in the temple. At the same time, the existence of a Torah scroll in the temple in 2 Kgs 22:8 does not necessarily prove the existence of a collection of books (library) in the seventh century BCE – *pace* A. Lemaire, "Writing and Writing Materials," *ABD* 6 (1992) 999–1008 (1005).

[52] Thus also A. S. van der Woude, *Pluriformiteit en uniformiteit* – O*verwegingen betreffende de tekstoverlevering van het Oude Testament* (Kampen: Kok, 1992).

on the scholarly discussion.[53] On the basis of Greek evidence from Hellenistic Alexandria, Lieberman distinguished between "inferior" (φαυλότερα) biblical texts used by the people, "popular" texts used in "many" synagogues as well as in schools and *baté midrash* (κοινότερα or *vulgata*, "widely circulated"), and "exact scrolls" (ἠκριβωμένα) in the temple. This model is based solely on external parallels and not on any extant Hebrew texts (except for the so-called Severus scroll or "book of R. Meir," some readings of which are quoted in rabbinic literature, which Lieberman considers to be representative of the *vulgata*).[54] *Pace* Lieberman it stands to reason that in synagogues[55] and *bate midrash* use was made only of corrected scrolls. The aforementioned descriptions in rabbinic literature point in this direction[56] and furthermore, various discussions in rabbinic literature revolve around the exact spelling of words, such as in *b. Sukk.* 6b, various examples in *b. Sanh.* 4a, and *b. Menaḥ.* 93b (Lev 16:21 ידו/יד), all of which would require the availability of exact copies.[57] This assumption is also supported by the two precise scrolls found under the floor of the synagogue at Masada. Therefore, Lieberman's view that the precise scrolls were found *only* in the temple is unlikely.[58] Furthermore, it seems that the evidence cannot be fitted into a three-fold division. Temple circles and rabbinic Judaism probably thought only in terms of two groups, namely "exact scrolls" ("corrected scrolls") written according to rabbinic instructions and all other scrolls. The people probably did not think at all in terms of textual groups, as evidenced, for example, by the variety of texts held at Qumran. Modern scholars will find it difficult to divide the known evidence into three different groups, since Lieberman's model is both deficient[59] and excessive.[60]

---

[53] Lieberman, *Hellenism*, 22–7. The second edition of this chapter (1962) did not revise the first edition of 1950.

[54] By the same token, this text may be described as "inferior" because of its many phonetic mistakes.

[55] Lieberman's views on the type of Bible text used in synagogues are unclear. On p. 22 he says that the "popular" Bible texts were used in "many synagogues and in the schools." But on p. 26 he states: "It seems likely that they used for the same purpose [viz., rabbinic exegesis] the current vulgar text, although they officially recognized the Temple copy of the Bible as the only genuine one for the use in the synagogue service." Lieberman does not state how this official text was introduced to the synagogues. He could not have referred to the precise copies, as these were described on p. 22 as "the copies of the temple."

[56] See the aforementioned quotation from *b. Pesaḥ.* 112a.

[57] Much material has been collected by Y. Y. Yellin, *Hdqdwq kyswd bhlkh* (Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1973) 336–56.

[58] According to Talmon, "Three Scrolls," 14 (n. 36 above), Lieberman was of the view that "only books of the first category were considered suitable for the public reading in the synagogue," but this description does not represent what Lieberman, *Hellenism*, 22 said.

[59] The model has no room for early precise texts different from MT like 4QJer^{b,d}. These are also exact scrolls, but for the temple circles, which adhered only to the proto-Masoretic texts, these scrolls were not acceptable.

[60] It seems that the distinction between inferior and popular scrolls is unrealistic, both with regard to the available evidence and the *Sitz im Leben* of these texts.

Finally, the evidence of the *tefillin* from the Judean Desert supports our thesis. The majority of the *tefillin* found at Qumran, written in the Qumran scribal practice, contain combinations of the four sections prescribed in rabbinic literature and additional ones, among them the Decalogue and Deuteronomy 32, while some contained only sections not prescribed by the rabbis.[61] At the same time, a minority of *tefillin* found at Qumran, written in the orthography of MT, reflect the prescriptions of the rabbis. While the Qumran evidence is divided, mainly pointing to non-rabbinic systems, the *tefillin* from other sites in the Judean Desert only reflect the rabbinic instructions, thus further underlining the connection between these sites and the Jerusalem center.

In sum:

a. Two groups of proto-MT scrolls are distinguished:

– The texts found in sites in the Judean Desert other than Qumran belong to the same family as the Masoretic medieval texts. This tradition is reflected also in the biblical quotations in rabbinic literature, as well as in most Targumim. These scrolls are therefore considered as the inner circle of the proto-MT family. The link between these sites and the Jerusalem center is further underlined by the evidence of the *tefillin*.

– Similar texts from Qumran deviate from the medieval tradition in some details, they are less precise, and they do not conform with the rabbinic instructions for writing Scripture scrolls in technical details. These scrolls belong to the second circle of proto-MT scrolls.

b. The rebels of Masada and the freedom fighters of Bar Kochba possessed Hebrew and Greek biblical scrolls that closely reflect the instructions of the Jerusalem spiritual center, as expected, since they were influenced by them also in other ways.

c. Identity between two or more texts could have been achieved only if all of them were copied from a single scroll, probably the master copy of each biblical book as preserved in the temple until 70 CE.

d. The carefully copied identical biblical texts found in the Judean Desert probably belong to a group that is mentioned in rabbinic literature as "corrected scrolls." These texts, which must have been extant in various places in Israel, were copied from or corrected according to the master copies found in the temple court.

To these conclusions, two remarks are added:

a. The analysis is based on rabbinic sources, but even if these sources are conceived of as tendentious or irrelevant,[62] most of our textual assumptions are still valid. For the unusual identity between the ancient and medieval sources of MT

[61] For an analysis, see chapter 4* and *Scribal Practices,* 270–71.

[62] Other data in rabbinic literature relating to the textual transmission are imprecise. Cases in point are the lists of "changes" by the Greek translators and of the so-called emendations of the Scribes.

remains a given probably to be explained through the assumption of a master copy and careful copying and production of *de luxe* copies such as found in the Judean Desert.

b. This study refers only to the transmission of MT, not to its quality. Even its inferior readings were transmitted carefully, as is often the case in Samuel.

In our view, a combination of the literary evidence and that of the excavations at Masada shows that we may identify the texts used in the synagogue as the "corrected scrolls" mentioned in rabbinic literature. These scrolls contain the proto-rabbinic text. This situation probably prevailed in all of Israel, and many details known about these scrolls are in agreement with the instructions for the writing of Scripture scrolls written down at a later stage in rabbinic literature.

This argument possibly ties in with the assumption of Binder with regard to a close connection between the temple and the synagogues.[63] It stands to reason that the temple authorities would have been interested in maintaining the copy in the temple as the base for Scripture scrolls used everywhere in Israel, including synagogues.[64]

II. Greek Texts Used in the Ancient Synagogues

Unlike the evidence for the Masada synagogue, there is no direct archeological data for the use of specific copies of *Greek* Scripture in synagogues in Israel or in the diaspora. It is likely that the Greek translation of the Torah was used in Egypt in the third and second centuries BCE, but this assumption cannot be proven.[65] At the same time, there is ample literary evidence for the notion that Scripture was read in Greek in religious gatherings of Greek-speaking communities from the

[63] Binder, *Into the Temple Courts*, 343–50, 479–500 (see n. 2 above); L. Levine, "The First-Century Synagogue," 26–7 (see n. 1 above) does not accept this view.

[64] The analysis referred only to scrolls copied and distributed in Israel, and not to the diaspora. The scrolls sent or brought to Alexandria for the translation of Greek Scripture did not derive from temple sources. See the remarks above. It is also unlikely that the vulgar text of R. Meir's Torah, used in Rome in the third century CE, derived from the temple. Rabbinic literature preserves references to a Torah scroll taken by Titus to Rome as booty after the destruction of the temple. In a later period, this scroll was given by Severus (reigned 222–35 CE) to a synagogue that was being built with his permission. This scroll, also known as the Severus scroll, was of a vulgar type. From the scant information known about the contents of that scroll, it appears that its characteristic features are the weakening of the gutturals, the writing of non-final letters in final position, and the interchange of similar letters. For details, see J. P. Siegel, *The Severus Scroll and 1QIs[a]* (SBLMasS 2; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975). Also Josephus, *B. J.* VII 150, 162 mentions that a copy of the Jewish Law was taken by Titus from the temple. However, it is unlikely that this was the main temple copy. The vulgar character of the Severus scroll would not have befitted scrolls found in the temple, and the information given by Josephus is very vague.

[65] Thus also G. Dorival in *Bible grecque*, 120.

first century BCE onwards.[66] Among other things,[67] Philo refers to this custom in Alexandria.[68] 4 Macc 18:10–18, possibly written in Egypt in the first century CE, expressly mentions the reading of the Law accompanied by reflections taken from the Prophets, Psalms, and Hagiographa. A liturgical use is indicated probably also in the last sentence in Expansion F to Esther which names the book of Esther as a whole "the Epistle of Phrurai [= Purim]" (ἐπιστολὴν τῶν Φρουραι), regarded as an Epistle from Mordecai to the Jewish people concerning the feast of Purim. Further, the LXX was used by learned writers, such as Philo in Egypt in the middle of the first century BCE, Josephus in Rome at the end of the first century CE, as well as Pseudo-Ezekiel and other, less known, Jewish-Hellenistic authors.[69]

For the use of Greek Scripture in Israel, probably the clearest reference is contained in the so-called Theodotos inscription from Jerusalem, usually ascribed to the first century CE. This inscription[70] states that "Theodotus, son of Vettenos a priest and *archisynagogos*, son of an *archisynagogos* and grandson of an *archisynagogos*, built this synagogue *for the reading of the Law* (εἰς ἀν[άγν]ωσ[ιν] νόμου) and the study of the commandments …" The inscription is in Greek, and it may therefore be assumed that the synagogue was used by a Greek-speaking community. Hengel cautiously suggests that this synagogue was connected to the Greek-speaking synagogue of Roman freedmen mentioned in Acts 6:9 (Λιβερτῖνοι).[71] Another such synagogue, a "synagogue of the Alexandrians in Jerusalem" is mentioned in *y. Meg.* 3.73d and *t. Meg.* 2.17.[72] On the other hand, the fact that several scrolls of Greek Scripture were found at Qumran does not indicate that these scrolls were read or used either privately or in religious gatherings. The nature of the Greek text finds in the Judean Desert is such that at all sites in that area there are indications of the active use of Greek as a living

---

[66] Early papyri of the Pentateuch from Egypt (P.Ryl. Gk. 458 [200–150 BCE] and P.Fouad [first century BCE]) show that the Greek translation was known in various parts of the country, but they do not necessarily prove use in religious gatherings.

[67] For an early analysis of the evidence, see Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 48–61.

[68] Philo, *Prob.* 81–82: "They use these laws <those of the Torah> to learn from at all times, but especially each seventh day, since the seventh day is regarded as sacred. On that day they abstain from other work and betake themselves to the sacred places which are called synagogues … Then one of them takes the books and reads." See further Philo, *Hypoth.* 7:13; *Moses* 2:215. The existence of Greek Torah scrolls is also referred to in *m. Meg.* 1.8; 2.1 and *t. Meg.* 4.13.

[69] The writings of these authors have been reviewed by P. W. van der Horst, "The Interpretation of the Bible by the Minor Hellenistic Jewish Authors," in *Mikra,* 519–46.

[70] See J. B. Frey, *CIJ* (Rome: Citta del Vaticano, Pontificio Istituto di archeologia cristiana, 1952) II.232 f, No. 1404; B. Lifschitz, *Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives* (CahRB 7; Paris: Gabalda, 1967) 70–71.

[71] M. Hengel, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (London/Philadelphia: SCM Press/Trinity Press International, 1989) 13.

[72] For a discussion, see E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B. C.–A. D. 135)* (ed. G. Vermes et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979) II.76.

language in documentary papyri of different types, including in Naḥal Ḥever where the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll was found together with documentary Greek papyri. Only at Qumran is this not the case, since, with the exception of a documentary text 4QAccount gr (4Q350), no documentary Greek papyri were found there; the literary Greek texts found at Qumran (mainly Scripture texts) were probably brought there because they happened to be among the possessions of one of the Qumranites.[73]

When turning to the question of which text(s) of Greek Scripture was/were used in Greek-speaking communities, we are groping in the dark. Was it the text that we reconstruct as the OG translation such as reproduced in the critical editions of Rahlfs or the Göttingen Septuagint, or was it a different form, earlier or later? As for the possibility of earlier texts, several Qumran Torah scrolls (especially 4QLXXLev^{a} and 4QpapLXXLev^{b}) provide glimpses of a text earlier than the Göttingen model that is slightly more distant from MT than the main tradition of the LXX and uses a less fixed vocabulary of Hebrew-Greek equivalents than the main LXX tradition (cf. chapter 23*, § I,1).

When we come closer to the synagogue environment, we find texts that were corrected according to the proto-rabbinic Hebrew text used in rabbinic circles, both BCE and CE. A major source for this assumption is the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever dated paleographically to the end of the first century BCE (cf. chapter 23*, § I,10). This Greek scroll was revised according to the proto-rabbinic Hebrew text, together with other parts of the Greek Bible, and all of these together are named the *kaige*-Th revision. This development implies that there were central forces in the Jewish world assuring that the text that had been made central in its original, Hebrew/Aramaic shape would be central also in its Greek shape. The fact that the Greek Minor Prophets scroll was found among the remains of the followers of Bar Kochba, linked to the Jerusalem religious circles, is not without importance. It probably implies that this Greek text had the *imprimatur* of the rabbinic circles. In this regard, it should also be mentioned that this scroll, together with other early revisional manuscripts of the LXX, represented the name of God not with κύριος but with paleo-Hebrew characters.[74]

The find of the Minor Prophets scroll in Naḥal Ḥever probably implies that some of the followers of Bar Kochba read the Greek Scriptures in this revised version, and this may also have applied to other Greek-speaking communities in Israel.

By the same token, adherence to the similar revision of Aquila, one-and-a-half centuries later than that of *kaige*-Th, is visible in rabbinic literature, as most

[73] See chapter 23*.

[74] Scribes A and B of 8ḤevXIIgr (end of 1st century BCE); P.Oxy. 50.3522 of Job 42 (1 CE); P. Oxy. 7.1007 (leather) of Genesis 2–3 (3 CE); P.Vindob. Gr 39777 of Psalms 68, 80 in the version of Symmachus (3–4 CE); the Aquila fragments of Kings and Psalms (5–6 CE).

quotations in the Talmud from Greek Scripture reflect that translation (see the evidence collected by Reider[75] and Veltri[76]) and *y. Meg*. 1:71c says about him יפיפית מבני אדם. This acceptance of the Jewish revision of Aquila by the Rabbis[77] goes together with the rejection of the main tradition of Greek Scripture, the LXX. Such a rejection is reflected in several places in rabbinic literature, such as *Sof*. 1.7: "It happened once that five elders wrote the Torah for King Ptolemy in Greek, and that day was as ominous for Israel as the day on which the golden calf was made, since the Torah could not be accurately translated." However, according to Veltri, if these traditions are properly analyzed, they do not prove the rejection of the LXX by the rabbinic sources.[78] Since Veltri's analysis is limited to a number of passages in the Talmud, and disregards the manuscript finds of early Greek Scripture texts from Israel and Egypt, it should nevertheless be concluded that the LXX *was* rejected at least from a certain period onwards, described by Dorival as being from 100 CE.[79]

Thus, the manuscript evidence shows a group of Jewish revisions of the LXX[80] in accordance with an ever-changing proto-rabbinic Hebrew text (see chapter 23*). These revisions reflected the need to use a Jewish-Greek text based on the content of the Hebrew Bible, often different from that of the Greek Bible. Several of these revisions antedated Christianity (*kaige*-Th [reflected among other things in 8ḤevXIIgr], P.Oxy. 7.1007, and P.Rylands Gk. 458). Whether or not the circles that moved away from the LXX were identical to those that are commonly named rabbinic is not known, but they were closely related. Note, for example, that *kaige*-Th is rightly described in the subtitle of Barthélemy's *Devanciers* as "sous l'influence du rabbinat palestinien."

The analysis of the Hebrew and Greek texts in ancient Israel points to the influence of the Jerusalem religious circles on the shape of the biblical text in the original languages and in Greek, as well as in Aramaic. Together with this trend, altogether different copies were scorned, so that the Samaritans were accused of falsifying the Torah[81] and the Greek translators were said to have inserted

---

[75] J. Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew & Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila*, Ph.D. diss., Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia, 1916, 151–5.

[76] Veltri, *Eine Tora*, 186–90.

[77] The Aquila fragments from the Cairo Genizah and the Fayoum probably show a wide distribution of use. Justinian in his *Novella* 146 from the 6th century (*PL* 69 [Paris: Garnier, 1878]) 1051–4 settles an argument within the synagogue by allowing the use of Aquila's version alongside that of the LXX: "… damus illis licentiam ut etiam interpretatione Aquilae utantur."

[78] Veltri, *Eine Tora*. See also my review in *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 75–82.

[79] G. Dorival in *Bible grecque*, 120–22.

[80] A similar development is visible in the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament, which in the Gospels are often closer to MT than the main LXX text, and can often be linked with the *kaige*-Th tradition. For a summary and examples, see M. Harl in *Bible grecque*, 276–7.

[81] See *y. Sot*. 7.23c, *b. Sot*. 33b (זייפתם תורתכם) with regard to the addition in SP of מול שכם in Deut 11:30.

changes in the translation.[82] Had the LXX and SP not been preserved and the Qumran scrolls not been found, we would have known little about non-rabbinic copies of Hebrew Scripture.

[82] See my analysis in *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 1–20.

Chapter Thirteen

The *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* – An Important Step Forward

1. Background

When the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* reaches completion around 2010 (?), it will be a century since the appearance of the first editions of the *Biblia Hebraica.*[1] A century is a long time, and indeed the first editions are very primitive when compared with *BHQ*. *BHQ* also greatly improves upon *BHS* that will have been in print for some thirty years by that time. Many developments in the field of textual criticism, as well as in the realm of *Editionstechnik* necessitated a new edition of the type of *BHQ*. *BHS* remains the most frequently used edition in the field, but since much criticism has been voiced against it, the time was considered ripe for a change as the *BH* series is constantly being renewed. The organizing bodies[2] could not have found a better general editor than Adrian Schenker who embodies all the qualities needed for this job: insight and innovation in textual criticism, understanding of the delicate relations between textual criticism, exegesis, and literary criticism, organizational talent, and clarity of thinking. He and the organizing bodies behind the edition were able to gather a fine group of specialists, both the general editors and the individuals responsible for the biblical books. These scholars constitute an international and ecumenical team including, for the first time in the *BH* series, Jewish scholars.

BHQ (*Quinta* = Fifth) may not be the ideal name for this edition due to the ongoing confusion regarding the numbering of the editions in the *BH* series, and because of the possible confusion with the name *BQ* (*Biblia Qumranica*). Be that as it may, with the publication of a sample edition of the book of Ruth in 1998[3] and now with the publication of Part 18 of *BHQ* (C + 96 + 168* pp.), a

---

[1] *BH* (1st and 2d editions; ed. R. Kittel; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1905, 1913; 3rd ed.; ed. R. Kittel and P. Kahle; Stuttgart: Württembürgische Bibelanstalt, 1929–1937; "7th ed." 1951). The term "seventh edition" (see title page and p. XXXIX) is misleading, as *BHS* is considered to be the fourth edition and *BHQ* the fifth. For the confusion, see the title page: *editionem tertiam denuo elaboratam ad finem perduxerunt, editionem septimam auxerunt et emendaverunt A. Alt et O. Eissfeldt.*

[2] The initiative comes from the United Bible Societies, while the German Bible Society serves as the sponsor (see "General Introduction," VII).

[3] *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (ed. A. Schenker et al.), *Fascisculus extra seriem*: *Megilloth, Ruth* (ed. J. de Waard; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998).

beginning was made to this important edition. The present edition contains the following elements:

"General Introduction" in English (pp. VII–XXVI), German (pp. XXVII–L), and Spanish (pp. L–LXXI)
Figures (pp. LXXIII–LXXV) illustrating the system of annotation
List of sigla, symbols, and abbreviations (pp. LXXV–LXXXIV)
Definitions and abbreviations for the terms used to characterize readings (pp. LXXXV–XCIV)
Glossary of common terms in the Masorah Parva (pp. XCV–XCVII)
Table of Accents (pp. XCIX–C)
Edition of the Five Megillot (pp. 1–96)
Detailed introductions and commentaries to each of the Megillot (pp. 5*–150*)
Bibliography (pp. 151*–68*).

Altogether, this first fascicle contains 364 pages. The final edition of the complete Bible will be of different proportions, as the text editions will be separated from the commentaries.

2. The System as Described in the "General Introduction"

The history of the *preparations* for the edition and its background are well described in the "General Introduction" (pp. XII ff). Many details and principles that may not be clear to the first-time user are clarified. The extremely detailed, judicious work by HOTTP since 1969 has not been in vain, since the editorial principles of the present editorial board (Y. A. P. Goldman, A. van der Kooij, G. J. Norton, S. Pisano, J. de Waard, R. D. Weis, with A. Schenker as director) continue those of the earlier HOTTP committee (counting as members such eminent scholars as D. Barthélemy, A. R. Hulst, N. Lohfink, W. D. McHardy, H. P. Rüger, and J. A. Sanders). I say "has not been in vain," since the masterpieces of textual scholarship edited by D. Barthélemy and others have not received the attention in scholarship that they deserve. Probably better known were the volumes which laid out the working principles of these scholars (HOTTP), while the volumes providing the detailed description of the text-critical cases (*Critique textuelle*) were less known, probably because the system followed was less practical for critical scholarship.[4]

[4] These volumes commented only on textual differences between *modern* translations (*RSV*, *NEB*, *Bible de Jérusalem*, *Revidierte Luther Bibel*), discussed in great detail by the committee, which usually opted for the Masoretic reading. The very detailed discussion in these volumes was too technical for Bible translators, and the choice of readings discussed was unrealistic for the textual critic. At the same time, it should be noted that when taken together, Barthélemy's masterly introductions to the individual volumes form an almost complete introduction to textual criticism.

The "General Introduction" describes the history of the *BH* series, without entering into too much detail regarding the different philosophies espoused in earlier editions. The issues raised in this introduction are reviewed here, as judged from their application in the edition itself.

a. The presentation of the *base text* of the *BH* series, codex L, is brought to an absolute state of perfection. The editorial committee brought aboard A. Dotan, the connoisseur *par excellence* of the text and Masorah of that codex. The intricacies of the presentation of the codex are described in the introduction, but since Dotan participates in this edition (for the Masorah, as the title page states), the reader would like to know what the differences are in the presentation of codex L in *BHQ* and in the two diplomatic editions of the same codex which bear Dotan's own name.[5] As *BHQ* deviates occasionally from L (note the remarks in the "General Introduction," IX–X), how does the presentation of the text in this edition compare with Dotan's system in his own editions? The editorial board is aware of the limitations of L (some mistakes, some missing vocalizations, its relative distance from Aaron Ben Moshe Ben-Asher's system as opposed to the closeness of the Aleppo Codex to that system), and accordingly considered other options (the Aleppo codex or a combination of sources), but ultimately decided to adhere to L, not least because a proofread electronic version of that codex was already available ("General Introduction," IX).

b. A major change in the *presentation of the Masorah* is that the Masorah Magna is now provided in full immediately below the printed text, in contrast to the conglomeration of cryptic numbers appearing in *BHS*, cross-referring to lists in Weil's edition of the Masorah.[6] The system in *BHS* was indeed very unusual, and one wonders how many users ever looked up a detail in the Masorah Magna in Weil's edition. The Masorah of L is now presented more or less diplomatically, including its mistakes and discrepancies with the text of L itself (commented upon in the notes), and with the addition of modern verse numbers, not needed by the masters of the Masorah themselves. A detailed commentary on the notes of the Masorah, in English (pp. 25*–50*), introduces the reader to its treasures and clarifies many an ambiguity.

c. As the principle chosen for the *inclusion of details in the apparatus*, "[t]he editors intend that, so far as possible, the apparatus will include all cases of variation in these witnesses that meet two general criteria for inclusion. First, such a variation is judged to be text-critically significant. … Second, it is judged to be potentially significant for translation or exegesis" ("General Introduction," XIII).

---

[5] A. Dotan, תורה נביאים וכתובים מדויקים היטב על פי הניקוד הטעמים והמסורה של אהרן בן משה בן אשר בכתב יד לנינגרד (Tel Aviv: Adi, 1976); *Biblia Hebraica Leningradiensia* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001).

[6] G.E. Weil, *Massorah Gedolah manuscrit B.19a de Léningrad,* vol. I *Catalogi* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1971).

The first criterion is seemingly self-evident,[7] although the significance of many readings included in the apparatus is not obvious, especially when secondary readings are involved. The second criterion probably encompasses almost all variations, since almost any variation is of interest at some exegetical level, if exegesis is understood to include linguistic development, orthography, and even scribal errors in Qumran scrolls (see below). These definitions have to be kept in mind as the following paragraph indicates that *BHQ* innovates in the direction of including more variations than previous editions.

d. *Formulaic explanations*. The apparatus contains a long series of formulaic explanations of the background of deviations from MT in the versions which are explained as exegetical rather than pointing to Hebrew variants. See further chapter 18*, § 3 β 5.

e. *Exegetical variations.* The principle of including any variation that is "potentially significant for translation or exegesis" involves the recording of many variations from the versions and the Qumran scrolls which are indeed relevant to biblical exegesis and the history of the transmission of the biblical text (§ d above). In these cases, *BHQ* offers more than just the data, as a judicious analysis on the textual commentary usually rules out the possibility that these are primary (original) readings or (in the case of the ancient versions) that these exegetical renderings are based on Hebrew variants differing from MT (for examples, see § d above). However, one wonders whether the editors rendered the readers, especially the less experienced among them, a good service. Would it not have been better to record these readings in a separate apparatus, or possibly not at all? After all, many of these readings do not belong to a critical apparatus of a textual edition (see below). In my view, this type of recording should be left for *borderline* cases in which it is unclear whether the translational deviation reflects the translator's exegesis or a Hebrew/Aramaic variant, and should not be employed when the editors themselves suggest that a reading in a Qumran scroll reflects an obvious mistake, or when a translation reflects content exegesis. For example, in the case of Esther, the paraphrastic character of the LXX and Targum is well established, and therefore the exegetical notes referring to these translations probably should have been far fewer in number since almost certainly they do not bear on text-critical issues. However, *BHQ* decided to break new ground with this novel type of notation.[8]

[7] The editors are aware that not all these variations reflect Hebrew variants: "In other words, the reading arguably, but *not necessarily* <my italics, E. T.>, represents a Hebrew text differing from the edition's base text" ("General Introduction," XIII).

[8] The "General Introduction," XIII, is well aware that the novelty of this type of recording transcends the textual treatment of the Hebrew Bible in the past, but the editors nevertheless decided to include notes illustrating the translators' exegesis.

The principles behind this system have been adopted from the *HUB*[9] and, more so than that publication, they make the edition less user-friendly.[10] However, while the *HUB* only contains borderline cases between exegesis and the reflection of possible variants in the translation, *BHQ* records many instances of exegetical renderings in the versions.

f. *Textual and literary criticism. BHQ* heralds a major change in approach towards textual data that, according to the editors, should be evaluated with literary rather than textual tools since they involve data that may reflect literary editions of a biblical book different from MT, and are therefore absolved from textual judgment.[11] For an analysis, see chapter 18*, § 3 β.

g. *Cautious evaluation. BHQ* presents reconstructed variants from the versions more cautiously than in the past, but stops short of making a direct link between a reconstructed reading preferred by that edition, and the text of the version (this practice is carried over from *BHS*). For an analysis, see chapter 18*, § 3 β.

h. *The manuscripts from the Judean Desert* are fully recorded in *BHQ*, including both significant readings – possibly preferable to the readings of MT and/or the LXX – and those that are secondary. For an analysis, see chapter 18*, § 3 β.

i. *Medieval manuscripts.* The reduction in the number of medieval manuscripts covered is a distinct improvement. For an analysis, see chapter 18*, § 3 β.

j. *Conservative approach to evaluations.* Textual evaluations in *BHQ* are very conservative when compared with earlier editions in the *BH* series. Thus, while in Canticles in *BHS*, 32 variants are preferred to MT,[12] the editor of *BHQ* makes only three[13] such suggestions (phrased as "pref").[14] In all other cases, the text of MT is preferred.[15] By the same token, in Ruth, compared with seven instances of a preference for a non-Masoretic reading in *BHS*, *BHQ* prefers only one, in 4:4;[16] there are no conjectures in the apparatus. In *BHS* in Lamentations, 49 prefer-

[9] Thus R. D. Weis, "*Biblia Hebraica Quinta* and the Making of Critical Editions of the Hebrew Bible," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 7 (2002) [http://purl.org/TC], § 16.

[10] The notation of *BHQ* is more complicated than that of the *HUB*, since in the latter edition the explanations are included in a separate apparatus of notes, while in *BHQ* the evidence is adduced *together* with its explanation in a single apparatus.

[11] See chapter 18*, n. 61.

[12] Textual suggestions in *BHS* are phrased in different ways, sometimes in conjunction with question marks or words such as "probably." I counted 23 cases of "*lege*," one case of "*prps*," 2 cases of a gloss, two instances of "transpose," one case of "delete," two suggestions of additions, and one of an insertion.

[13] Cant 4:12; 7:7, 10. Preferences of *Ketiv* to *Qere* or vice versa are not included.

[14] In addition, in Cant 2:14, the apparatus mentions a conjecture in vocalization.

[15] In the words of the editor, "The text of Canticles is well preserved," p. 8*.

[16] In the words of the editor (p. 5*): "The Masoretic Text in M^L has been very well preserved." The author probably meant: The text of Ruth has been well preserved in MT according to codex L.

ences[17] for readings other than MT are matched with only 7 similar preferences in *BHQ*. No conjectures are recorded in the latter apparatus.

k. *Ancient Versions.* The apparatus contains an extensive presentation of the evidence, fuller than in *BHS*, well documented and described in the Introductions (pp. 5*–24*). On the whole, the treatment of the versions is better and definitely more careful than in the past. Among other things, secondary versions made from the LXX such as the Old Latin are now quoted only when they differ from the Old Greek, and they are not quoted alongside that translation.

l. *Retroversions.* The apparatus contains an extensive presentation of the textual evidence that is at variance with the main text, MT as represented by codex L. For an analysis, see chapter 18*, § 3 β.

m. *User-friendly edition?* On the whole, *BHQ* is much richer in data, more mature, judicious and cautious than its predecessors; this advancement implies more complex notations which almost necessarily render this edition less user-friendly for the non-expert. The juxtaposition in the apparatus of a wealth of exegetical readings and important variants as well as some of the complex explanations in the introduction will be grasped only by the sophisticated scholar. I do not think that *BHQ* can live up to its own ideal: "As was true for its predecessors, this edition of *Biblia Hebraica* is intended as a *Handausgabe* for use by scholars, clergy, translators, and students who are not necessarily specialists in textual criticism … specialists in textual criticism should also find the edition of use, even though it is not principally intended for them" ("General Introduction," p. VIII). The commentary and the introductions (see below) go a long way in bridging the gap for the non-specialist, but I do believe that the specialist will grasp the finesses of the sophistication better than the non-specialist who will often be confused. Time will tell whether this assessment is correct.

3. The Commentary and Introductions

The publication of a detailed textual commentary (pp. 51*–150*) in which difficult readings are discussed, including an analysis of all readings preferred to MT, represents a great step forward from all other editions. The discussion describes all the relevant issues and is usually thorough and judicious. The readings discussed present textual problems, for all of which an opinion is expressed. One of the many advantages of this commentary is that it discusses conjectures such as those suggested for MT שמן תורק in Cant 1:3 regardless of their acceptance by the editors. In the reading quoted from Canticles, the difficulties of the MT wording

[17] I counted 19 cases of "*lege*," 19 of "*prps*," one instance of "transpose," 7 cases of "delete," one of "add," and two of "insert."

are analyzed, but the editor (P. D. Dirksen) does not feel that any other reading is preferable to MT.

The strength of a commentary is in the relation between the generalizations and the detailed remarks. Indeed, the authors of the commentaries constantly deduct generalizations from details, and explain details according to what is known from comparable instances.

Within this framework, much attention is given to the Hebrew and translational base texts, described at length in the "General Introduction" and the individual commentaries on the Five Megillot. The "General Introduction" describes codex L (pp. XVIII–XX) and eight other Tiberian manuscripts (pp. XX–XXV) at length. The other sources are evaluated in the beginning of the commentary to each biblical book. These descriptions are very useful as they describe in detail the character of the individual witnesses such as the LXX and especially their text-critical value. Although the descriptions are brief, they show that the editors have a real grasp of the material, and many a brief note may lead others to continue these investigations. Thus the note about the relation between the LXX and Peshitta in Ruth ("the translator of S apparently did not use G in any consistent way" [p. 7*]) is very instructive. In Canticles, the introduction mentions orthographic variations not entered in the apparatus. On p. 9*, the differences in intervals between the collated Tiberian manuscripts of Canticles are listed. One also finds a helpful summary of the main secondary features of the scrolls recorded in the apparatus itself. There is even a brief summary on the research of the relation between LXX-Cant and *kaige*-Th in that book. The commentary on Qohelet contains a good critique of Rahlfs's edition that is accused of being too close to MT.

4. Sigla and Abbreviations

The use of sigla and abbreviations in *BHQ* shows that this edition has entered a new era. No longer does it operate in a world of its own, but instead follows the *SBL Handbook of Style* and the *Chicago Manual of Style.* It no longer refers to the Septuagint but to the "Old Greek" (p. LXXVI). On the other hand, in the case of the Dead Sea Scrolls, *BHQ* uses the outdated list of J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* from 1990, and not the summarizing list in *DJD* XXXIX that is usually employed by scholars.[18]

For the first time in the history of the *Editionsgeschichte* of Hebrew Scripture, and possibly for the first time in the history of the textual criticism of that litera-

[18] For the biblical scrolls, the differences may be small, but not all scrolls appear in Fitzmyer's list. For the non-biblical scrolls, which are quoted in *BHQ*, the differences are more substantial.

ture, the editors try to express in abstract terms the relation between the reading of MT and the other readings in categories of relevance and irrelevance. These relationships are explained in the "General Introduction" as "The typology underlying the characterizations" (pp. LXXXV–LXXXVIII). In these four pages, the editors summarize their textual *Weltanschauung* in a way that will be helpful only for the most sophisticated readers imaginable, but they, too, should be allowed to look inside the think tank of the *BHQ*.

The first category of relations between MT and the "other" reading pertains to the relevance of that reading or rendering (in *BHQ*'s terminology: the "case") to the text-critical problem. The following types of readings are characterized "as not bearing on the issue in the case" [strange English, incidentally]: "illegible", "insufficient", "indeterminate", "irrelevant" and "literary". "Literary" is a strange bedfellow with the other descriptions, but the principle is clear. The bottom line is that all these cases have no bearing on text-critical evaluation, although the categories themselves are very different.

The other groups of readings have some bearing on "the case" (thus explained on p. LXXXV): "II: characterizations of one reading as differing from another, identifying only the point of difference" (the only example given is "differ", with various sub-divisions). Group III contains "characterizations of one reading as representing a type of change from another reading, but not commenting on the motivation of the change." The following phenomena are listed in this group: "conflation, double reading/translation, gloss, metathesis, omission, spontaneous, trans-position," but it is unclear why all these phenomena are named "changes." All these phenomena describe textual situations that make a reading (usually a variant) different from the reading of MT, but a "difference" is not a "change," as the latter implies an intention. But even if we mentally translate "change" to "difference,"[19] are these the only phenomena of this kind? In our view, the next group, IV, "characterizations of a reading as representing a change arising through accident" is also wider than indicated. The following phenomena are included in this category: dittography, haplography, homoioarcton and homoioteleuton. Indeed, all these phenomena have arisen through accident, creating a difference (named "change" in *BHQ*) between the variant and the reading of MT. But these are not the only readings that have been created by "accident". Similar phenomena are mentioned elsewhere in *BHQ*'s categorization: conflation, double reading, metathesis, omission.

There is no need for further analysis of the categories, but the details in this particular categorization are problematical. It is hard to know for whom this

[19] This problem in terminology obtains throughout the introduction, and the reader gets the impression that the wrong term is used all over: whenever *BHQ* mentions a "change," probably a "difference" is meant. Furthermore, the lack of distinction between reading and variant (that is a Hebrew entity) on the one hand and rendering (in an ancient translation) on the other further complicates the use of this list.

abstract system of subdividing the descriptions into different categories is helpful. It almost sounds as if these pages were written primarily as guidelines for the collaborators in the project.

All the *abbreviations* of the sources and terms used (LXXVI–LXXXIV) are the standard abbreviations and are clearly explained.[20]

The description of the "alphabetical list of the characterizations and their definitions" is usually helpful and it definitely breaks new ground, enabling the readers to understand such standard explanations as "harmonization, interpretation, paraphrase, translational adjustment," etc. Most of the "abbreviations" are briefly explained in the list of that name, and the explanations used in the apparatus (named "characterizations" on p. LXXXVIII) are explained in full on pp. LXXXVIII–XCIV. However, not all abbreviations and definitions are equally clear.

– Ampl(ification) is described as a scribal phenomenon. The definition on p. LXXXVIII adds: "'Ampl' is to be distinguished from 'lit' in that the former refers to developments within the textual transmission of a single edition of a book, whereas the latter presupposes the survival of more than one edition of a book." While the theory behind this description is acceptable, it seems that the reader/user will be confused by the terms used.

– Confl(ation) is described as "a reading arising from the merging of two otherwise attested readings." Is one to assume that all conflations presuppose the survival of the two readings?

– Crrp "signals a judgment that the text is disturbed in some way…" Is "disturbed" the right term?

– Div: It is unclear what "div" stands for on p. LXXXI ("division of the consonantal text") [to increase the confusion, this abbreviation stands for "divine" in the apparatus of the *HUB*]. Does this abbreviation refer to differences in word division?

– Interp(retation) is explained with a very long and sometimes unclear description (appearing next to "interpol[ation]", the abbreviation "interpr" would have been better). Usually this term accompanies the text of one of the textual witnesses interpreting the lemma-word. Sometimes, however (Qoh 1:17; 12:5), the word also appears in the lemma itself, thus confusing the reader.

– Interpol(ation): "… the reading as having arisen from the insertion into the text of textual matter from another document, or another part of the same document." Can a learned scribe not insert his own thoughts in the form of an interpolation?

– KR: Under this abbreviation (which, at first, I thought referred to the *kaige* revision, this being its standard abbreviation), the reader finds "the manuscripts described in the editions of Kennicott and de Rossi" (are these manuscripts really "described" or are they "collated"?).

– Midr(ash): "this term proposes that the reading is inspired by an extant midrashic tradition." However, is the midrashic tradition always "extant," and should we not occasionally surmise that a midrash-like tradition is involved?

[20] On the other hand, the complicated explanations of "ast" and "obelos" are completely unintelligible. "Smr" for SP represents an unusual and probably misleading abbreviation.

– *Tiq(qun) soph(erim)*: The definition on p. XCIII (" … whether or not the case is judged actually to be such an emendation") is preferable to that on p. LXXXIV (" … whether or not the emendation is judged to be genuine").

– "Unconv": Explanations need to be self-evident. Will every reader guess that "unconv" stands for "unconverted" rather than "unconventional"?

The annotated list of abbreviations is helpful, not only as a description of the phenomena described in *BHQ*, but also as a guide for textual criticism in general. Thus a copyist or translator may be "ignorant" of such data described as "ign-cultur," "ign-gram," "ign-lex." If all these data were available to the readers of *BHQ* in electronic form as they are to those of *BHS*,[21] the reader could compare the various instances belonging to the same category, such as ignorance of the cultural background of the Hebrew Bible. Naturally, the reader would not have a grasp of the complete picture, since not all examples of a given category have been adduced in *BHQ*, but the combined picture would still be helpful.

Summary: This reviewer has found occasion to disagree with some major and minor details in the philosophy of the recording and in the explanations provided in the various sections of the edition. Without such disagreements, scholarship does not advance. However, it should be strongly stressed that, on the whole, *BHQ* is much richer in data, more mature, judicious and cautious than its predecessors. It heralds a very important step forward in the *BH* series. This advancement implies more complex notations which almost necessarily render this edition less user-friendly for the non-expert.[22]

[21] *Stuttgarter Elektronische Studienbibel* (ed. C. Hardmeier, E. Talstra, and B. Salzmann; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and the Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap, 2004).

[22] The reader is further referred to my summary statement in § 2m above.

Chapter Fourteen

The *Ketiv/Qere* Variations in Light of the Manuscripts from the Judean Desert

1. Background

This study deals with the background of the *Ketiv/Qere* variations in MT, addressing some of its aspects from the angle of the Judean Desert finds and rabbinic literature. Since these variations belong exclusively to the medieval Masorah and Masoretic manuscripts, they should be compared with or looked for in the forerunners of these very manuscripts, that is the so-called proto-Masoretic scrolls. Such scrolls have been found at almost all manuscript sites in the Judean Desert, and a differentiation between the various types of ancient scrolls is in order for a better comparison with the Masoretic *Ketiv/Qere* variations.

When comparing the medieval MT manuscripts with the Judean Desert texts we distinguish between two types of proto-Masoretic scrolls, an *inner circle* of scrolls and a second circle of such scrolls that are rather similar to them. The inner circle of texts, so named because of their proximity to rabbinic circles, is found in all Judean Desert sites except for Qumran, while a second circle of scrolls was found at Qumran. The texts of the inner circle are identical to the medieval MT text, while those of the second circle are very similar to them. For a detailed description of these two groups of texts, see chapters 10* and 12*.

2. Ancient and Medieval Texts

The consonantal framework of the medieval manuscripts is identical to that of the proto-Masoretic Judean Desert scrolls from sites other than Qumran, but there is more to these texts than their consonants. For the medieval tradition also carefully preserved all the scribal features included in its ancient source and they are now part and parcel of the Masorah: *puncta extraordinaria* (originally: cancellation dots), paragraphing (open and closed sections), raised letters originally meant as corrections, broken letters representing damaged elements, majuscule and minuscule letters representing different sizes of letters, and a pair

of *sigma* and *antisigma* signs in Num 10:35–36 indicating superfluous elements, transformed in the Masoretic tradition to inverted *nunim*.[1]

All these features must have been copied from a proto-MT source – such as the Judean Desert scrolls – by the scribe(s) of MT responsible for the creation of the text that was perpetuated until the Middle Ages. These features are early since they are mentioned in rabbinic literature (see below), and they are so much an integral part of tradition that if, for example, a scribe changed the paragraphing of the scroll, it was no longer considered acceptable for reading.[2] By the same token, a manuscript indicating verse division also was not acceptable.[3] It stands to reason that all these Masoretic phenomena were carefully transferred from an early scroll or scrolls, since the Judean Desert scrolls evidence *sigma* and *antisigma* signs, paragraphing, *puncta extraordinaria*, etc., but a *caveat* is in order. Masoretic manuscripts and ancient sources sometimes differ in the details of paragraphing,[4] and no known scroll evidences the *puncta extraordinaria* or the *sigma* and *antisigma* parenthesis signs in exactly the same places as in MT.[5] However, this lack of evidence probably derives from the fact that no proto-MT manuscript has been preserved that covers the specific verses in which these Masoretic features are found.

3. *Ketiv/Qere* Variations and the Ancient Sources

Having reviewed the correlation between the Masoretic features and the Judean Desert scrolls, we note that one major feature of the rabbinic traditions and medieval manuscripts is *not* reflected in any proto-MT source or, for that matter, in any text from the Judean Desert, namely the procedure of *Qere* notations. These notations range from 848 to 1566 instances in the different medieval manuscripts, and this practice involves the replacement of a reading in the text

[1] For details and bibliography, see *TCHB*, 59–87.

[2] See *b. Shabb.* 103b פרשה פתוחה לא יעשנה סתומה סתומה לא יעשנה פתוחה (An open section may not be written closed, nor a closed section open). Likewise *Sof.* 1.15: פתוחה שעשאה סתומה סתומה שעשאה פתוחה הרי זה יגנז (If an open section was written as closed or a closed section as open, the scroll must be stored away). See further, *Sifre* Deuteronomy 36.1 on Deut 6:9.

[3] See *Sof.* 3.7 ספר שפסקו ראשי הפסוקים שבו אל יקרא בו (If a Torah scroll has spaces <to mark> the beginning of verses, it may not be used for the lections). Indeed, all ancient Hebrew scrolls and unvocalized medieval Bible codices do not indicate verse division, which is now part of the Masorah.

[4] Since columns are of a different size, open and closed sections are bound to occur in different places in different scrolls, and accordingly they could not always be reproduced exactly in the next round of copying. Among other things, open and closed sections occurring at the end of the line or just before the end cannot be distinguished well. Systems used in the Middle Ages as compensation for these situations had not yet been developed.

[5] One instance comes close, and even though the scroll in question is far from being proto-Masoretic (1QIsa[a]), the data are striking: 1QIsa[a] XXXVII 15 (Isa 44:9) המה. This word, dotted in MT, was written in 1QIsa[a] as a supralinear addition without dots (ועדיהמה המה).

(*Ketiv*) with a *Qere* reading. These *Qere* readings of MT have not been found as corrections in the margins of the proto-MT scrolls 1QIsa[b] and MurXII (other proto-MT scrolls do not cover relevant verses in MT).[6] By the same token, no scroll[7] or translation[8] reflecting all or most of the *Qere* readings in the *running* text is known. More generally, the very phenomenon of marginal notations is not known in the scrolls and the biblical scrolls record no variants, either in the margins or elsewhere.[9]

The only partial parallel in the scrolls to *Ketiv/Qere* variations is the appearance in the Qumran scrolls of linear and supralinear corrections of mistakes, both elements omitted with cancellation dots or other systems, and elements added above the line (see especially 1QIsa[a] and 4QJer[a]).[10] But there are differences between the two systems. *Qere* readings mainly represent early variants, while the corrections in the scrolls primarily pertain to scribal errors. Some of these corrections in the scrolls are substantial, namely long additions between the lines of erroneously omitted segments, such as in 1QIsa[a] and 4QJer[a].[11] Other correcting additions pertain to words, clusters of letters, and single letters added to the base text. It is here that the Qumran evidence differs from the *Qere* readings, since only some of the latter may be conceived of as corrections of errors. Furthermore, most of the *Qere* readings pertain to single letters (added, omitted, or changed), while most of the corrections in the scrolls are more substantial.

Some scholars rightly admit that the background of the *Qere* readings remains enigmatic,[12] but some aspects may nevertheless be clarified. One of the problems inherent with the *Qere* readings is the fact that the corpus of its readings is of a varied background and no single solution can explain all of its types. One line of thought is the assumption that the *Qere* readings, presented by the Masorah as corrections, started off as manuscript variants that did not carry any binding force. At one time, these variants may have been included in the running text of one or more important manuscripts that differed from the equally important

[6] In the preserved sections of 1QIsa[b] parallel to the MT of Isaiah, none of the eight *Qere* readings has been denoted as a correction in the margin or supralinearly, and this pertains also to the five instances of *Qere* covered by MurXII.

[7] This issue can be examined for 1QIsa[b] (2x K, 4x Q, 1x different reading) and MurXII (3x K, 2x Q).

[8] According to the statistics of Gordis, *Biblical Text*, 66, the Peshitta and Vulgate reflect some 70 percent of the *Qere* readings and the LXX some 60 percent, while in some books the percentage is higher for the LXX. These data imply that the translations were made from manuscripts that happened to contain many *Qere* readings in the texts themselves.

[9] See *Scribal Practices*, 224–5.

[10] For the former, see the evidence collected by Kutscher, *Language*, 531–6. For the latter, see, for example, *DJD* XV, 153.

[11] E. g., 1QIsa[a] XXX, between lines 11 and 13 and vertically in the margin of the following sheet; XXXII 14 at the end of the line vertically in the margin; XXXIII 7 at the end of the line and vertically in the margin; 4QJer[a] III 6 (Jer 7:30–8:3).

[12] For example, I. Yeivin, *Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah* (trans. and ed. E. J. Revell; SBLMasS 5; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1980) 61.

Ketiv text.[13] In any event, the *Qere* readings should not be considered corrections, since they intervene in the text inconsistently, and sometimes are inferior to the *Ketiv*.[14]

We now turn to the background of these *Qere* readings. In chapter 12* we suggest that the proto-MT scrolls from the Judean Desert sites were copied from the master copy in the temple court. These scrolls, probably part of a group mentioned in rabbinic literature as "corrected copies," represented precisely the copy in the temple court, including its smallest details such as cancellation dots above the letters. These scrolls must have been copied very precisely since otherwise the manuscripts could not have been identical.

However, if, as I have hypothesized, the carefully written proto-MT scrolls from the Judean Desert were copied from the master copy in the temple, including the preservation of *minutiae* such as these dots, one wonders why no ancient parallel has been found for the *Qere* procedure that is so characteristic of the medieval manuscripts. Therefore, can we still claim that the temple court copy was the basis for the corrected scrolls and the medieval tradition? I suggest that we can hold to our view if we differentiate between most Masoretic notations that had an ancient origin and the *Qere* readings that were added to the Masorah at a later period. According to this assumption, neither the temple scroll nor the so-called corrected scrolls included any *Qere* readings in the margins; they were introduced for the first time in written form in the medieval manuscripts.[15] This implies that the *Qere* differs from the other Masorah features, all of which are evidenced in the Judean Desert scrolls. The background of the *Qere* thus needs to be sought outside the realm of the Judean Desert scrolls. A few remarks on this suggestion are in order:

a. We should not look for parallels to the *Qere* readings in the *margins* of ancient scrolls, for they were not written there. We are probably misled by the manuscripts of MT and by modern editions, both of which represent the *Qere* as marginal corrections or footnotes.[16] But the Masoretes had no such intention;

---

[13] For an analysis of the various possibilities, see Gordis, *Biblical Text*, e. g., Prolegomenon, p. XXIX: "By the side of the archetypal manuscript they selected a small number of others of high repute. From them they [scil., the early Masoretes] copied the variants they regarded as worthy of attention and noted them on the margins of the archetypal manuscript." In his summary on p. XLI, Gordis says: "The Kethibh thus preserved the reading of the archetype, while the Qere is a collection of variants from other manuscripts." See further the analysis in *TCHB*, 58–63.

[14] See Gordis, *Biblical Text* and Tov, *TCHB*, 58–63.

[15] H. M. Orlinsky, "The Origin of the Kethib-Qere System: A New Approach," *VTSup* 7 (1960) 184–92 likewise suggested that the *Qere* was not written in manuscripts before the second half of the first millennium of our era.

[16] This notion permeates the literature. E. g., in his influential handbook, Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 183 notes: "… Accordingly the marginal variant or the official reading, called the *Keri* (קרי), is to have the vowel-points …" Likewise, on p. 184: "It is to be remarked that this corpus of official various readings has been transmitted to us in three different forms. (1) Originally each of these variations was given in the margin of the text against the word affected by it. The

they simply included the *Qere* in the *Masorah parva*, and that apparatus as a whole was positioned in the margin. The Masoretic practice does not imply that the individual *Qere* readings were also positioned in the margin at an earlier stage.

b. Another reason for not looking for the *Qere* readings in the margins of scrolls is because the *Qere* procedure was from the outset an oral, not a written, procedure and was therefore necessarily represented by a single reading. The major argument in favor of this view is the traditional terminology creating an opposition between a *Ketiv*, a written form, and a *Qere*, an element which is read.[17] In the past, this view was presented by Levin and Breuer and, with more clarity, by Barr.[18] The procedure of *Ketiv wela Qere* (a word written but not read) and *Qere wela Ketiv* (a word read but not written) makes this view even more likely, since zero consonantal readings could not be recorded in the margin or text before the invention of vocalization.

c. The oral tradition of *Qere* readings is at least as old as rabbinic literature, in which reading traditions differing from the written text are referred to as "we read" (קרינן). For example, *b. Erub.* 26a records, referring to 2 Kgs 20:4, "It is written 'the city,' but we read 'court'."[19] In the discussion, the *Ketiv* is mentioned, but disregarded: נאמר ויהי ישעיהו לא יָצָא (אל) חצר התיכונה כתיב העיר וקרינן חצר.

d. At an earlier stage, the most central *Qere* reading was accepted by the LXX translators. The employment of κύριος in that translation for the Tetragrammaton probably reflects the same custom that was later reflected in the Masoretic

---

word in the text was furnished with a small circle or asterisk over it, which directed the reader to the marginal variant. This ancient practice still prevails in all Massoretic MSS of the Bible and is adopted in all the best editions." Likewise, Gordis, *Biblical Text*, Prolegomenon, p. XXVII and passim talks about the *Qere* as being written in the margin of MT.

[17] The theory that the *Qere* represents an oral tradition is not without problems because, according to this view, all *Qere* readings should be orally distinguishable from the *Ketiv* forms. However, this is not always the case, as in:

– K/Q readings involving haplography, such as:

2 Sam 5:2 K והמבי את / Q והמביא את (Gordis, *Biblical Text*, list 7)

– third person singular pronominal suffix, such as:

Gen 9:21 K אהלה / Q אהלו (Gordis, *Biblical Text*, list 4)

– interchange between *holam* and *qametz hatuph* (Gordis, *Biblical Text*, lists 30 and 31), such as Josh 9:7 K אכרת לך / Q אכרות לך, 2 Chron 8:18 K אוניות / Q אניות

– interchanges of לא/לו.

The background of this non-distinction in pronunciation between some K/Q variations is that even though the *Qere* reflects a reading tradition, it was originally based on manuscripts that included variants that are not distinguishable orally.

[18] S. Levin, "The קרי as the Primary Text of the תנך," *Hagut Ivrit be'Amerika* I (Heb.; Yavneh, 1972) 61–86; M. Breuer, "אמונה ומדע בנוסח המקרא," *Deoth* 47 (1978) 102–13; J. Barr, "A New Look at Kethibh-Qere," *OTS* 21 (1981) 19–37.

[19] Manuscripts and editions likewise indicate here: Ketiv העיר, "the city," *Qere* חצר, "court." For further examples, see *b. Yoma* 21b (on Hag 1:8); ibid. 38b (on 1 Sam 2:9); *b. Men*. 89b (on Lev 23:13). See also *Midrash Qere we-la Ketiv* included in the collection of A. Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrasch* 5 (Vienna, 1873; repr. Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrman, 1967) 27–30.

"perpetual *Qere*." The Greek tradition was early, though not necessarily as early as the third century BCE as claimed by Gordis,[20] since the earliest manuscripts of the LXX probably contained the transliteration IAΩ, as in 4QpapLev^{b}.[21]

e. The *Ketiv* text probably represents the ancient copy in the temple. That copy evidently could no longer be changed,[22] as otherwise either the *Qere* readings themselves would have been incorporated into it or the whole scroll would have been replaced with the *Qere* scroll. The preference for the *Qere* scroll was perhaps due to its being a newer version,[23] replacing several groups of archaic *Ketiv*s such as the female *Qere* form *atti* (אתי) corrected to *at* (את) and the archaic third person plural feminine *qatlah* corrected to *qatlu*.[24] The nature of the *Qere* text differed from book to book as may be expected in a corpus composed of different scrolls.[25]

Summarizing, we note:

1. The proto-Masoretic texts from the Judean Desert (except for Qumran) are identical to the medieval manuscripts and exactly represented their source, probably the scroll of the temple court.

---

[20] Gordis, *Biblical Text*, xvii.

[21] Published by P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX. For an analysis, see chapter 23*.

[22] This situation reminds us of the procedures followed by the Masoretes at a later period. When adding vowels to the text, the Masoretes could no longer change the consonantal framework because that was sacrosanct, requiring them sometimes to superimpose on the letters a vocalization that went against the letters themselves. For examples, see *TCHB*, 43.

[23] Thus also Gordis, *Biblical Text*, xxviii. In Gordis's view, after the master copy was deposited in the temple, and when it was recognized that the scroll was occasionally in error, it was annotated with marginal corrections from other manuscripts. The procedure followed for the addition of these corrections was described in the *baraita* in *y. Ta'an.* 4.68a (see chapter 12*, n. 38) about the three scrolls found in the temple court (Gordis, p. xli). However, such a procedure is not described in this *baraita*.

[24] For the former, see, for example, Judg 17:2 and for the latter 1 Kgs 22:49 K ובֹרה/ Q ובֹרו. For the full evidence, see Gordis, *Biblical Text*, lists 13–25. See also M. Cohen, *The Kethib and the Qeri System in the Biblical Text – A Linguistic Study of the Various Traditions* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2007); S.E. Fassberg, "The Origin of the Ketib/Qere in the Aramaic Portions of Ezra and Daniel," *VT* 29 (1989) 1–12.

[25] Probably the more stable the textual condition of the books, the fewer the variants that existed, and as a result fewer *Qere* readings were invoked. The fact that there are very few cases of K/Q in the Torah probably indicates that the textual transmission of that book was stable in the temple copy, while that of Samuel, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel was more fluid. Barr, "A New Look," 32 (see n. 18), who was the first to pay attention to the statistical aspects, provided the following figures:

Low figures: Genesis (15), Exodus (10), Leviticus (5), Numbers (9), MP (29)

Medium figures: Isaiah (53), Psalms (68), Job (52)

High figures: Samuel (155), Kings (118), Jeremiah (142), Ezekiel (123).

These figures are based on Dotan's edition of codex L. According to Barr, Daniel with 140 instances of K/Q is a special case, since most of them are in the Aramaic section.

2. These proto-Masoretic texts represent all the features of the medieval text and, presumably, of the temple copy, including all its scribal phenomena, with the exception of the Masoretic *Ketiv/Qere* variations.

3. The *Ketiv/Qere* variations were not included in the margins of any ancient text.

4. Rather, they reflect an oral tradition, which only at a late stage was put into writing in the Masoretic tradition.

Chapter Fifteen

The Writing of Early Scrolls: Implications for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture

Dating from the mid-third century BCE until the mid-second century CE, the biblical scrolls from the Judean Desert are very early in comparison with the medieval codices of MT. However, compared with the earliest copies of Hebrew Scripture, they are actually late. Whatever view one holds on the dates of the composition and final redaction of the books of Hebrew Scripture, it remains true to say that these activities preceded the copying of the Qumran scrolls by several centuries. Likewise, the composition and redaction of the biblical books preceded the OG translation by the same time span, as the LXX translation was produced between the beginning of the third century BCE and the end of the second century BCE.

The realia of writing and rewriting ancient scrolls forms the topic of this chapter, treated here in conjunction with a seemingly remote issue, namely the *literary* analysis of the Hebrew Bible.

The shape of the earliest copies of Scripture. To the best of our knowledge, the early biblical books or parts thereof must have been written on *scrolls* of either papyrus or leather. There probably was no alternative to the writing of texts in portable scrolls.[1] These ancient scrolls were ruled with the letters suspended below the lines, and inscribed in writing blocks or columns. There is no direct evidence regarding the main writing material for *long* texts used in ancient Israel[2] before the period attested by the Judean Desert scrolls. Both leather and papyrus were in use in Egypt at a very early period, but it is not impossible that leather was preferred in ancient Israel because it was more readily available than papyrus that

[1] Indeed, according to Jeremiah 36, Baruch recorded the dictations of Jeremiah on a scroll. As a result, the insistence in Jewish and Samaritan tradition on the scroll as the earliest form of the *Torah* is probably realistic. Thus, *Sifre* Deuteronomy § 160 (ed. Finkelstein [New York/Jerusalem: Bet Ha-midrash Le-rabbanim be-Amerikah, 1993] 211) explains every ספר in Scripture as a מגילה of leather, such as in Deut 17:18, where it is used in reference to the "book of the king."

[2] Thus R. Lansing Hicks, "*Delet* and *Mᵉgillah:* A Fresh Approach to Jeremiah XXXVI," *VT* 33 (1983) 46–66. One of the arguments used by Lansing Hicks (p. 61) is that a knife was used by Jehoiakim to cut the columns of Baruch's scroll exactly at the sutures since the text mentions that after every three or four columns, Yehudi cut the scroll (Jer 36:23). The use of a knife may indicate the cutting of a leather scroll, as a tool of this type would not have been needed for papyrus.

had to be imported from faraway Egypt. On the other hand, according to Haran, papyrus served as the main writing material during the First Temple period.[3]

From the various topics relating to the physical shape of ancient scrolls, we focus on two, namely correction procedures and the physical limitations of writing in a scroll.[4] The implications of this analysis will be treated thereafter.

1. Correction Procedures

Upon completing the copying, and often while still in the process, scribes frequently intervened in completed writing blocks; by the same token, later correctors and users often inserted their corrections in the text. Careful attention to the intricacies of the correction process known from the Qumran scrolls helps us to better understand not only scribal transmission, but also the growth of ancient literature. This intervention is known from the Qumran scrolls in four different forms, or combinations thereof.

– Removal of a written element by erasing or blotting out, crossing out, marking with cancellation dots or a box-like shape around letters or words.

– Addition of a letter, word or words in the interlinear space or, rarely, in the intercolumnar margin.

– Remodeling (reshaping) of an existing letter to another one.

– Altering the spacing between words.[5]

Not all these systems were employed in early scrolls, since some practices used in the Qumran scrolls had been imported at a later stage from other cultures.[6]

---

[3] M. Haran, "Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period. The Transition from Papyrus to Skins," *HUCA* 54 (1983) 111–22. In support of this assumption, Haran mentions the Egyptian influence on Canaan in this period that would have included the use of papyrus, the low price of papyrus in contrast to leather, and the biblical use of the root מח"ה, a verb signifying erasure of a written text with a liquid which is possible only in papyrus. Haran also refers to Jer 51:63 which mentions the binding of a stone to a scroll so that it would sink in the Euphrates River. According to Haran, this scroll was made of papyrus, since a leather scroll would have sunk without a stone. According to this scholar, at the beginning of the Second Temple period scribes started to use leather for long texts. However, it should be countered that already in ancient Egypt papyrus was used for very long texts. See further the discussion by A. Lemaire, "Writing and Writing Materials," *ABD* (New York: Doubleday, 1992) 6.999–1008.

[4] For a full discussion, see *Scribal Practices,* 222–9.

[5] Such changes were achieved either by indicating with scribal signs that the last letter of a word belonged to the following word or by indicating that there should be a space between two words which had been written as one continuous unit.

[6] Thus several correction procedures in the Judean Desert scrolls resemble notations used in Greek sources: crossing out of letters or words with a horizontal line, *antisigma* and *sigma* (parenthesis signs) and cancellation dots/strokes. Cf. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts*, 16. The latter two systems are not known from earlier Semitic sources, and may have been transferred from Greek scribal practices.

2. Technical Limitations of Writing in a Scroll

That the content of the Qumran scrolls (and the LXX) is relevant for the *literary* analysis of Hebrew Scripture has long been recognized, as they preserve a few vestiges of alternative formulations of the biblical books, such as in the case of Samuel, Jeremiah and Psalms, and possibly also Joshua and Judges. But we turn now to a related issue, viz. the possible relevance to literary criticism of correcting procedures used in the Qumran scrolls.

The discussion turns first to (a) technical difficulties in inserting substantial changes and additions, and in deleting elements in the inscribed text after the completion of the writing, then to (b) the relevant Qumran evidence. Subsequently (3) we turn to some implications of this analysis for the literary criticism of Hebrew Scripture.

One of the issues at stake is whether, from a technical point of view, scribes could insert significant changes in a scroll after the completion of the writing. We suggest that, as a rule, this was impossible.

a. Technical difficulties in inserting changes in the inscribed text

The first issue to which our attention is directed is that of the writing on leather and papyrus in columns and the difficulties encountered if a scribe wanted to insert corrections in more or less fixed writing blocks surrounded by relatively small margins. Because of these inflexible parameters, and also because of the limited possibilities inherent in the writing material, substantial correction of finished columns was technically almost impossible. Thus, after the completion of the writing, there simply was no space in the columns, margins, or anywhere else for any *addition* longer than one or two lines. Such additions could have been placed in three different positions, but in fact none was used for this purpose:

Margins.[7] In most Qumran scrolls, the sizes of the margins are relatively fixed and of limited scope and therefore could not be used for inserting substantial text. In these scrolls, the top margins are usually 1.0–2.0 cm, and the bottom margins are slightly larger (1.5–2.5 cm). Larger margins, between 3.0 and 7.0 cm, are rare in the Qumran texts, occurring mainly in the "late" texts from Naḥal Ḥever, Masada, and Naḥal Ṣe'elim dating to the first and second centuries CE. Such large margins occur almost exclusively within the tradition of authoritative Scripture scrolls containing MT, and are commonly a sign of a *de luxe* format as

[7] Most columns are surrounded by uninscribed top and bottom margins, as well as by intercolumnar margins. The rationale of these margins is to enable the orderly arrangement of writing blocks in rectangular shapes, even when the edges of the leather were not straight. The margins also enabled the handling of the scroll without touching the inscribed area. For this purpose, the bottom margins were usually larger than the top ones.

in similar Alexandrian Greek scrolls.[8] Since the size of margins has grown over the course of the centuries, early scrolls would not have contained large margins. Intercolumnar margins (1.0–1.5 cm) left little room for additions and, with a few exceptions, they were not inscribed in any of the known scrolls, and likewise top and bottom margins are inscribed only very rarely.

Handle sheets. Many scrolls included handle sheets, that is, protective sheets at the beginning or end of the scroll, or at both extremities. However, the known specimens of such handle sheets were uninscribed. Actually, from a technical point of view it would have been difficult to indicate where in the scroll a section written on an empty handle sheet belongs.

Repair sheets. Sheets were stitched together after the writing had been completed. Technically it would be possible to disconnect any two sheets and to insert between them a new one containing additional text, or to replace a sheet with a new one. In three cases, such sheets have possibly been preserved,[9] but the evidence is unconvincing. Further, in the case of an additional sheet it would actually be difficult to indicate with arrows or otherwise how the text in the repair sheet relates to the existing columns.

In sum, after the text was inscribed, it was almost impossible to add anything substantial to the written text, in the column itself, in one of the margins, or on a blank sheet at the beginning, end, or middle of the scroll.

Similar problems obtained with regard to the *deletion* of substantial segments in leather scrolls. Physical erasure in such scrolls would be almost impossible and very inelegant. In principle, any large segment could have been deleted with one of the deletion signs,[10] but these were not yet used in early sources and, besides, they too, would have been inelegant.

The same problems existed with regard to the insertion of *changes* within the writing block, that is, erasure followed by addition of amended text. Erasure in leather scrolls was almost impossible, let alone inscribing a substantial new text on an erased area. Therefore, if we were to visualize a scribe physically erasing all occurrences of the Tetragrammaton in the second and third book of the Psalter (Psalms 42–83 [but not 84–89]), and replacing them with *'elohim*, we would have to think in terms of a rather unreadable scroll.[11] By the same token, if the manifold theological corrections in the MT of Samuel, such as in theophoric names,[12] were created in this way, the scroll would have been rather unreadable.

The difficulties described above pertained to both leather (skin) and papyrus, but in one situation papyrus was more user-friendly than leather, as the written

[8] On scrolls of a *de luxe* format, see chapter 10*, § 3 and *Scribal Practices,* 125–9.

[9] The first sheets of 4QDeut^{n}, 4QJub^{a} (4Q216), and 11QT^{a} (11Q19).

[10] For details, see *Scribal Practices,* 222–9.

[11] Most scholars assume that such replacement took place, but they do not express a view on the procedure used.

[12] See *TCHB,* 267–9.

surface could be washed off and replaced with alternative content (if the two texts were of the same length). However, in the other types of correction, papyrus was as difficult for scribes as leather: In deletions on papyrus, an inelegant blank area had to be left in the middle of the inscribed text and likewise there was no space for substantial additions in the middle of the text in papyri.

b. The Qumran evidence

Having reviewed the technical difficulties regarding the insertion of corrections in leather and papyrus scrolls, we now turn to the Qumran evidence relating to textual intervention in biblical and nonbiblical scrolls. Although that evidence is relatively late in comparison with the earliest copies of the biblical books, it is still relevant as a source of information about correction procedures in earlier periods. Additionally, the Qumran corpus has the added value of providing direct information concerning the process of rewriting sectarian compositions, such as the Community Rule and the Damascus Covenant, written in the last centuries BCE. In the many copies of these compositions, the rewriting procedures can be examined closely by comparing their content differences.

The most salient observation relating to the biblical and nonbiblical Qumran scrolls is the absence of *visible* techniques for presumed procedures of correcting and rewriting. However, when assessing the absence of these techniques we have to ask ourselves whether the evidence of the biblical Qumran scrolls may be too late for understanding earlier processes of rewriting, whether such a process of rewriting took place at all, or whether the supposed rewriting procedure left no visible vestiges, such as large additions written in the margins.

If there are no physical remains of large content rewriting in Qumran scrolls, there is some evidence for content changes on a *small* scale in a few nonbiblical scrolls. For example, in 1QS VII 8, the length of the punishment for nursing a grudge against one's fellow-man (six months, also found in 4QS^{e} (4Q259) 1 i שים[ששה חוד]) was removed through the use of parenthesis signs and replaced by a more stringent punishment of "one year" written above the line. By the same token, several types of small content corrections in 1QH^{a} may have been based on other copies of Hodayot, such as 4QH^{c} (4Q429) and 4QpapH^{f} (4Q432).[13]

In the biblical scrolls, on the other hand, there is no visible evidence at all for small[14] or large content changes. This statement may come as a surprise, as the Qumran scrolls contain manifold interlinear corrections. However, most of these corrections pertain to scribal errors, corrected by the original scribe, a later scribe

[13] See *Scribal Practices,* 28.

[14] We disregard here a small number of linguistic corrections and word substitutions, such as found occasionally in 1QIsa^{a}.

or a reader.[15] The corrections themselves were based on the corrector's internal logic, his *Vorlage,* or another manuscript.[16]

If there is no visible evidence in the Qumran scrolls, biblical and nonbiblical, for procedures of content correction and rewriting, should we adhere to the assumption that such procedures nevertheless took place? In the case of a positive reply, how should we picture these procedures? Some scholars reject the assumption of content rewriting in biblical books, rendering it necessary to clarify now that we *do* accept the assumption of critical scholarship that most biblical books went through stages of revision after their initial writing. But having said this, we do not take a position as to how the rewriting took place. Analyzing the difficulties of the correction procedures and the evidence of the Qumran scrolls, we assume that generations of editors or scribes – the term does not matter[17] – *did not insert their content changes into existing copies*. No rewriting, adding, or deleting could be executed in the form of corrections of existing scrolls because of the aforementioned technical limitations of writing in scrolls. Instead, editors and scribes must have created fresh copies for expressing their novel thoughts. In other words, rewriting took place mainly in the *minds* of scribes/editors,[18] and therefore did not leave visible vestiges on leather or papyrus. As far as I know, this assumption is valid also for Greek papyri.

One might oppose this description by claiming that the Qumran scrolls (from the third pre-Christian century to the first century CE) are too late in the development of the transmission of Scripture for basing a view on developments in yet earlier centuries, when different writing techniques were possibly in vogue. True, we have little knowledge about these earlier periods, but probably at that time the

[15] 1QIsa[a] provides several examples of large-scale corrections: The original scribe of that scroll sometimes left out one or two verses, which were subsequently written in small letters between the lines: Cols. XXVIII 18 (Isa 34:17b–35:2); XXX 11–12 (Isa 37:4b–7); XXXII 14 (Isa 38:21); XXXIII 7 (Isa 40:7), 15–16 (Isa 40:14a–16). Interestingly enough, in some cases, the original scribe left room for these additions (XXVIII 18, XXX 11–12, XXXIII 15–16), and we are left wondering why the scribe did not fill in the text himself. In 4QJer[a] col. III, the scribe left out a major section by way of *parablepsis* (7:30–8:3), which was subsequently added between the lines, in the intercolumnar margin, and under the column, written upside down.

[16] See *Scribal Practices,* 222–9.

[17] It is hard to define these terms, as editors were also scribes, and even some authors must have been scribes (when reading and misreading his source scrolls, the Chronist acted as a scribe). The distinction between these two terms must have been chronological: in later periods scribes were merely copyists like medieval scribes, while in earlier periods each person writing a scroll considered himself a minor collaborator in the process of the creation of the biblical books. Such a person allowed himself small content changes. In yet earlier periods, the persons who were involved in major aspects of the creation of these books may be referred to as editors/scribes, as they wrote the biblical books in scrolls, while allowing themselves major content changes, such as the insertion of what is now a complete chapter.

[18] This description does not rule out the possibility that scribes used other scrolls, drafts, or private notes.

technical problems inherent with writing and correcting would have been even greater than at the time of the writing of the Qumran scrolls.

Our suggestion regarding the assumed process of rewriting of the biblical scrolls is supported by the Qumran evidence relating to parallel copies of *sectarian* compositions: the Community Rule (12 copies), War Scroll (7), Instruction (8), Hodayot (9), Damascus Document (10), etc. In these copies, very few physical vestiges of content rewriting are visible and, when nevertheless extant, they pertain to a few small details, as mentioned above. At the same time, in spite of the almost total lack of physical remains of content alterations recognized through the comparison of parallel copies, these differences are manifest also without external indications. The nature of these content differences indicates developed editorial activity. For example, in the Community Rule, Alexander and Vermes distinguish between four different editorial stages (recensions), which they named A, B, C, and D.[19] This also pertains to the various recensions of the War Scroll,[20] differing

[19] *DJD* XXVI, 9–12 distinguishes between "at least four recensions of S": 1QS, 4QS^{b} (4Q256) and 4QS^{d} (4Q258), 4QS^{e} (4Q259), 4QS^{g} (4Q261). As a rule, 4QS^{b} (4Q256) and 4QS^{d} (4Q258) present shorter versions of the Community Rule than 1QS. In this case, abbreviating took place in individual words, short phrases, and sentences, as indicated in the notes in the edition of J. H. Charlesworth (ed., with F. M. Cross et al.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, I, Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (Tübingen/Louisville: Mohr [Siebeck]/Westminster John Knox Press, 1994). Thus also P. S. Alexander, "The Redaction History of Serekh-Ha-Yahad: A Proposal," *RevQ* 17 (1996) 437–56. While the shorter texts of S from cave 4, 4QS^{b} (4Q256) and 4QS^{d} (4Q258), probably abbreviated a text such as 1QS, it is very difficult to decide in which details these texts represent shorter formulations or, alternatively, textual mishaps. The fact that the phrase "sons of Zadok the priests who keep the covenant" is found in 1QS V 2, 9, but is lacking in both 4QS^{b} and 4QS^{d}, seems to indicate that the omission or addition is intentional. The same problems obtain with regard to 1QS V 9 ולרוב אנשי בריתם which lacks יחד when compared with עצת אנשי היחד of 4QS^{b} (4Q256) IX 8 and 4QS^{d} (4Q258) I 7. On the other hand, in the same col. V of 1QS there are seven occurrences of יחד, the community's self-appellation, which are lacking in the parallel sections in 4QS^{b} (4Q256) and 4QS^{d} (4Q258). In the case of 4QS^{e} (4Q259), S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden/New York/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1997) 69–74 believes that the shorter text of that manuscript formed the basis for the longer text of 1QS. In contradistinction to all these scholars, G. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum, A Critical Edition* (JSP-Sup 35; Copenhagen International Series 8; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 2001) 707–10 believes that the differences between the various copies of S reflect "free variants – expansions, paraphrases, glosses added for clarity" (p. 707).

[20] J. Duhaime pointed out that 4QM^{a} (4Q491) and 1QM do not relate to one another as a source and its revision, but that both reworked an earlier source, now lost: "Dualistic Reworking in the Scrolls from Qumran," *CBQ* 49 (1987) 32–56; idem, "Étude comparative de *4QM^{a}* Fgg. *1–3* et *1QM*," *RevQ* 14 (1990) 459–72. For the sources, see the editions of 1QM (Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light* [Heb.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955]) and 4QM (M. Baillet, *DJD* VII; *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, 2, Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* [ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Tübingen/Louisville: Mohr [Siebeck]/Westminster John Knox Press, 1995]). For a more elaborate reconstruction of the composition process, see P. Alexander, "The Evil Empire: The Qumran Eschatological War Cycle and the Origins of Jewish Opposition to Rome," in Paul, *Emanuel,* 17–31, esp. 22. Thus, 1QM displays a greater emphasis on purity than 4QM^{a} (4Q491), and the former often has a

in the inclusion or exclusion of major segments.[21] Phrased differently, each copy of the Community Rule and the War Scroll should be considered a separate unit, since all of them contain idiosyncratic material. Since no physical evidence for the insertion of these content changes has been found in any of the extant manuscripts, it stands to reason that the differences between these copies were created not by inserting corrections in existing scrolls, but when writing a new scroll on the basis of an earlier one.

The differences among these copies of the sectarian compositions are greater than among the known Scripture manuscripts, but no greater than the assumed differences between early biblical scrolls, when large sections were still added, deleted, and rewritten. The Qumran non-biblical scrolls thus present us with a valuable parallel for an early stage in the development of the biblical books.[22]

3. Some Implications for the Literary Criticism of Hebrew Scripture

From the beginning of the critical scholarship of the Hebrew Bible, and especially within the historico-critical approach, scholars have assumed that many biblical books were composed of different layers superimposed upon earlier texts.[23] Such a new layer would have involved the addition or deletion of stories, lists, chronologies, psalms, etc. I am *not* speaking about a new creation that as a whole is based on earlier texts, such as the Chronicler who created a new composition using different sources for each historical period. Nor am I speaking about early editors who created new compositions by combining different written sources,

---

longer text than the latter. At the same time, several scholars suggested that 1QM presents a later revision of the cave 4 copies of the War Scroll: F. García Martínez, "Estudios Qumranicos 1975–1985: Panorama crítico," *EstBib* 46 (1988) 351–4; B. Nitzan, "Processes of Growth of Sectarian Texts in Qumran," *Beth Miqra* 40 (1995) 232–48 (Heb.); E. and H. Eshel, "Recensions of the War Scroll," in Schiffman, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 351–63.

[21] For example, 1QS cols. I–IV are lacking in the parallel position in 4QS^{d}. 4QS^{e} did not contain the so-called Hymn of the Maskil (1QS VIII 15–IX 11). 4QS^{g} may not have contained "The Rule for the Session of the Many" (1QS VI 8–23). At the same time, 4QS^{b} contains material not found in 1QS. 4QpapS^{a}, written in a crude cursive on the back of another text, and palaeographically probably the earliest exemplar of S, likewise contains some different material. Alexander and Vermes surmise that this copy may contain an early draft of the *Community Rule*, possibly even its first draft.

[22] In his analysis of the types of differences among the parallel nonbiblical texts from Qumran, Vermes remarked that they resemble those among different manuscripts of the biblical text: G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Forty Years On: The Fourteenth Sacks Lecture Delivered on 20th May 1987* (Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1987) 10–15.

[23] Indeed, one of the models which has been developed alongside the Documentary Hypothesis is the Supplementary Hypothesis (*Ergänzungshypothese*) of stories, laws, etc. added to an existing kernel. See, e. g., O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (3d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1964) 239–40.

such as the integration of the poetry of Jeremiah (source A) and his biography (B) into one coherent whole. We refer only to a scenario of an editor-scribe who rewrote an existing written text.

The assumption of rewriting previous formulations has become one of the axioms of historico-critical analysis, but as far as I know, little thought has been given to the realia of this rewriting. Introductions, commentaries, and monographs often speak about multi-layered compositions, long interpolations, and omissions of sections in the middle of the text (that is, in the middle of a column), but the technical aspects of such activities have not been discussed.[24] This lack of attention is understandable, since before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the realia of the writing procedure were far beyond the scholarly horizon. Accordingly, an assumption of multi-layered texts was usually judged on internal literary grounds only and not on their likelihood with regard to the realia of scribal activity. This pertains to all assumed layers in texts that had been superimposed on earlier texts, for example, a Supplementary Hypothesis in the Torah and elsewhere, the multi-layered composition of Deuteronomy, the assumed intervention of the Deuteronomist in the historical books and Jeremiah, etc. The assumption pertains also to the addition in the middle of the text (that

[24] An exception is the analysis of Lohfink, to be quoted below. For the New Testament, see M. Frenschkowski, "Der Text der Apostelgeschichte und die Realien antiker Buchproduktion," in *The Book of Acts as Church History. Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte* (ed. T. Nicklas and M. Tilly; BZNW 120: Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003) 87–107. In yet another instance, Schmidt and Seybold based their literary judgment on the realia of writing in scrolls, although in this particular instance the description of the scribal aspects is very questionable. H. Schmidt was quite advanced for his time when suggesting in 1948, when the scrolls were hardly known, that segments which he considered to be out of place in Habakkuk (Hab 1:2–4, 12–13; 3:18–19) were once written in the free spaces at the beginning and end of the scroll: "Ein Psalm im Buche Habakuk," *ZAW* 62 (1950) 52–63 (completed in 1948 and published in 1950). According to Schmidt, in a similar way the alphabetical psalm at the beginning of Nahum as well as Isaiah 12 were inserted into the text from the margin. The suggestion for Habakkuk was accepted with changes by K. Seybold, *Nahum Habakuk Zephanja* (Zürcher Bibelkommentare 24,2; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991) 47. However, as a rule there would not have been room for these verses at the beginning and end of the scroll. More importantly, if the sections are considered out of place in the book (thus Schmidt), why would someone have written them in the margins in the first place, and then subsequently moved them into the running text? These problems were discussed at length by B. Huwyler, "Habakuk und seine Psalmen," in *Prophetie und Psalmen, Festschrift für Klaus Seybold zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. B. Huwyler et al.; AOAT 280; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001) 231–59. Among other things, Huwyler highlighted the methodological problem of identifying different non-consecutive sections as organic parts of a Psalm, then assuming that they were written in segments in the margin and inserted as a non-consecutive text in the running text. It would have been more logical to assume that these segments had constituted one coherent psalm all along.

I cannot claim to have seen all the relevant studies; my judgment is based on a selection of commentaries, Introductions, and monographs, in addition to such summaries as R. N. Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch. A Methodological Study* (JSOTSup 53; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987).

is, column) of chronologies, genealogies, and hymns, such as those of Hannah and Jonah, to be discussed below.

To be true, unconsciously the scholarly perception is probably influenced more by modern writing habits than the realia of ancient scrolls. One thinks probably less in terms of the complications of writing in ancient scrolls than modern Bible editions, at one time those of van der Hooght, Letteris, and others, and now the *Biblia Hebraica* series. The modern mind, especially in the computer age, has become used to the ease with which one inserts changes into the text in split seconds. In earlier centuries, it was equally convenient to use cut-and-paste techniques with paper. Therefore, even the modern scholar, who knows that in the ancient world everything was different, sometimes does not realize that it was simply impossible to add or delete a section in the middle of a column. Continuing this line of thought *ad absurdum*, we should not imagine that an ancient scroll of the Torah or Joshua looked anything like P. Haupt's multi-colored edition named the *Polychrome Bible*[25] or *Regenbogenbibel*.[26]

I have little doubt that in all mentioned instances (among them, paragraphs a–f below) an earlier text was indeed changed or expanded towards the present form of MT. However, I submit that we should now take an additional step in trying to understand how these changes were inserted while using recently gained knowledge about the copying of manuscripts. An analysis of this type is meant to enrich literary research.

I submit that the shape of the earliest biblical scrolls did not differ much from that of the Qumran scrolls (with the possible exception of their length) and that therefore most rewriting was not superimposed on existing scrolls. From a technical point of view, it would have been very hard, if not impossible, to insert, for example, the story of Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) into a pre-existing scroll of Genesis or of the Joseph cycle, or to add Hannah's or Jonah's hymn to existing scrolls of Samuel and Jonah (or the Minor Prophets). More in detail:

a. Most scholars believe that the story of Judah and Tamar in Genesis 38 was originally not an integral part of the Joseph cycle. Scholars also agree that Hannah's hymn was attributed to her in the form of a prayer (at least in MT) by someone who thought that this pre-existing Psalm of thanksgiving was appropriate to the context. By the same token, a pre-existing thanksgiving hymn of the individual has been made into a prayer in the mouth of Jonah in chapter 2. In my

[25] P. Haupt (ed.), *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament* (Leipzig/Baltimore/London: Hinrichs/Johns Hopkins/Nutt, 1894–1904).

[26] This edition shows the editor's understanding of the complex nature of the biblical books that could never have existed in antiquity in any visible way. In the Torah, for example, different colors designate the sources J^1 (early, dark red) and J^2 (later, light red), E^1(early, dark blue), E^2 (later, light blue), JE combined (purple), P-late (brown), P-early (regular black), H (yellow), and D (green). In addition, overstrike signifies redactional additions.

view, these three chapters could not have been inserted into existing scrolls, but were rather added when new scrolls were created on the basis of earlier ones.

b. We refer not only to separate units as the ones mentioned above, but also to non-consecutive layers in biblical books. For example, following the Deuteronomy commentary of Steuernagel from 1900,[27] modern scholars distinguish between several compositional layers in that book. Steuernagel himself distinguished between a stratum in which the speaker turns to an addressee in the singular and one turning to addressees in the plural. In addition, he identified a layer of *to'ebah* laws (18:10–12; 22:5; 23:19; 25:13–16a) and one of laws of the elders (17:2–7, 8–13; 19:3–7, 11–12; 21:1–8, 13–22; etc.). Furthermore, according to Steuernagel, sundry layers of additions are visible in this book: among them various legal additions, such as those stressing the importance of priests (18:1, 5; 21:5; 26:3–4) and paraenetic additions (several sections in chapters 28, 29, and 30). One further recognizes a late layer requiring changes in the law due to the expanded borders of Israel in the centralization of the cult (12:20–24) and the law of asylum (19:8–10).[28] Finally, the kernel of the book was expanded with various pericopes, such as the poems in chapters 32 and 33.

c. The multi-layered story of Exodus 24 contains three fragments of accounts of Moses' ascent to Mt. Sinai. The three versions reflect different descriptions of the ascent of Moses, once alone (vv 2–8), once together with Aaron, Nadav and Avihu and seventy of the elders of Israel (vv 9–11), and once with Joshua (vv 12–15). If the story was composed layer upon layer, the base story was twice rewritten by two different editors/scribes.[29]

d. The book of Jeremiah underwent a complicated process of rewriting, probably being expanded in one of its last stages from a shorter text (reflected in 4QJer^{b} and 4QJer^{d} as well as in the LXX) to a longer one (MT).[30] Alternatively, the long edition was abbreviated to the short one. This process of expansion or abbreviation apparently took place in the mind of an editor, and not in the form of corrections to an existing scroll.

e. The "Elohistic" copyist/editor of the second and third books of Psalms (Psalms 42–83, but not 84–89) corrected at least the divine names,[31] if not more, while replacing each יהוה with אלהים. The changes were probably made during

[27] C. Steuernagel, *Deuteronomium und Josua* (HAT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900) iii ff.

[28] Not every layer uncovered in Deuteronomy necessarily requires the assumption of a separate scroll, since an early editor may have inserted corrections of different types in a single scroll.

[29] Alternatively, according to the documentary hypothesis in its classical formulation, someone combined parts from three different sources: vv 2–8 (J ?), vv 9–11 (E ?), vv 12–15 (P?).

[30] See *TCHB*, 313–49.

[31] Cf. e. g. changes made in Psalm 53 as compared with Psalm 14 (14:2 = 53:3; 14:4 = 53:5; 14:6 = 53:6; 14:7 = 53:7).

the writing of a new scroll, not through the crossing out of words in an existing scroll, and the writing of the new ones above the deletion.

f. The book(s) of Joshua-Judges, which underwent a very complicated editorial process, contain(s) long Deuteronomistic sections which should be considered additions when compared with the presumed original book. For example, the introductory chapters and framework of the individual stories in Judges as well as a layer of rewriting in Joshua including several speeches and the pericope Josh 8:30–35 (the erection of an altar on Mt. Ebal) were added only at a later stage. Presumably, the Deuteronomist must have had at his disposal an older version of Joshua-Judges. He created his new version in a new scroll, as it would have been impossible to insert these changes in an existing scroll.

We now turn to the *implications* of the analysis so far. If the preceding description holds true, in early times the content of the biblical books could have changed with the writing of each new scroll. Continuing this line of thought, if so many scrolls were circulating, what was the typological relation between them? Was the transmission complex, that is, scribes could rewrite just any copy on which they laid their hands (model 1)? In this case, one could speak of parallel transmission or parallel copies. Or was the transmission relatively simple with each new scroll based directly on the preceding one, in linear transmission (model 2)? One need not necessarily decide between the two models, since there is also room for their co-existence.[32] When the merits of the two models are compared, the authoritative status of scrolls created using one of the two procedures needs to be assessed as well.

According to model 1, an early book was rewritten independently by any number of scribes whose versions should be considered parallel to one another and possibly even equally authoritative.[33] In this scenario, an early copy of a biblical book was completed by editor 1, and was rewritten independently, possibly in different localities, by both editor/scribe 2 and editor/scribe 3, etc. In this model, there could be any number of related, *parallel* books in the same or different localities. In the reality of this first model, the term "parallel" designates that every scribe/editor could have rewritten almost any scroll, without taking into consideration the content of other scrolls. As a result, at any given time scrolls of different content were circulating (this description pertains to relatively large differences in content, not to differences created during the course of scribal transmission).

The point of departure of model 2 is a "production line" of a biblical book, created in a linear way, stage after stage. In this model, the creation of editor/scribe 1 formed the basis for the edition of editor/scribe 2, which, in its turn was

[32] In that case, one should imagine the creation of both parallel copies and copies displaying a linear transmission.

[33] Possibly, within this large group of scrolls, one scroll or production line was more authoritative than the others.

the basis for a creation by editor/scribe 3. In this model, there is no room for parallel versions.

Both abstract models have their internal logic, and therefore the only way to decide between these options is to see whether one of them is supported by textual evidence.[34] The main question for discussion is whether we can detect among the early textual witnesses any proof of the existence of two or more parallel versions of a biblical book, differing in matters of content. All textual witnesses differ in details created during the course of the textual transmission, but are there differences that require the assumption of *independent* writing or rewriting of a text unit? In other words, is there a chapter or part of a chapter of a biblical book known in alternative formulations? It seems to me that such evidence cannot be found, and therefore all differences between the textual witnesses must have resulted from a linear development, mainly the creation of a long text from a short one or vice versa. Focusing on the largest differences among textual witnesses, it seems that the long and short texts of MT (= 4QJer^{a,c}) and the LXX (= 4QJer^{b,d}) in Jeremiah, as well as in Ezekiel, Joshua, and the story of David and Goliath indicate a linear development from short to long or long to short versions.[35] Further, there is no clear evidence in favor of parallel versions in any one book. Due to the absence of convincing evidence in favor of the first model, I opt for the second one, assuming linear development in the writing and rewriting of biblical books. This linear development took place as long as the editors/scribes were involved in creating the last stages of the biblical books, and not merely in their textual multiplication. However, not all compositions developed in the same way, and in the case of the Qumran sectarian writings, the situation is less clear, as several of the copies of the sectarian compositions may indeed reflect parallel formulations (model 1).

We now continue our analysis of the early development of the biblical books. The assumption of linear development may provide the best explanation for the textual evidence, but it also creates new problems, and needs to be thought through from all directions. We need to give attention to the conditions under which an editor/scribe could have rewritten an earlier scroll, to be revised in a later generation. How did this person gain access to the earlier scroll? Our de-

[34] However, as a rule, scholars formulated their views on the development of the biblical books without connection to textual finds. Criticism against this practice was voiced by R. Lohfink, "Deuteronomium und Pentateuch, Zur Stand der Forschung," in idem, *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur III* (SBAB 20; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1955) 13–38 (21). According to this scholar, Wellhausen and Steuernagel described the early copies of Deuteronomy as parallel editions subsequently combined into one *opus*, Noth described the development of Deuteronomy as fragments combined into a single edition, while others assume that a single kernel was expanded with various additions. The definition of these three models has been transferred from the study of the Torah (the documentary hypothesis, the fragments theory, and the supplementary hypothesis).

[35] See the detailed analysis in *TCHB,* 313–49.

scription almost necessitates the further assumption that all rewriting took place in one location, possibly a central one, where books were written, deposited, and rewritten. Otherwise it cannot be explained how any editor-scribe could continue the writing of his predecessor. The only such place I can think of would be the temple. This center presumably had sufficient authority to prevent the writing of rival versions elsewhere.

If books were constantly rewritten, we should also ask ourselves what happened to the earlier copies, that is, the ones preceding the rewritten version. It was the intention of the person creating that rewritten composition that it was to replace the earlier one(s), which, as far as the author of the rewritten composition was concerned, had become superfluous. He created what he intended to be the final version, but likewise when the earlier versions were put into writing, they, too, were meant to be final. It is thus necessary to assume that upon its completion, each formulation in the chain of such formulations was considered final and was possibly distributed and became authoritative. But when a new formulation was created and circulated, the previous one(s) could no longer be taken out of circulation. In any given period, therefore, several different copies of certain biblical books must have been circulating.[36] Therefore, even at a late period such as the time of the LXX translation or that of the Qumran corpus, different literary formulations were circulating. As a result, the Qumran corpus included both 4QJer^{a,c} (= MT), which probably had the *imprimatur* of the Jerusalem spiritual center in the last centuries before the Common Era, and 4QJer^{b,d} (= LXX) which must have been authoritative at an earlier period.

We surmised that the literary activities described above could have taken place only in a central place, where these books were deposited.[37] Our suggestion that

---

[36] This description is based on the evidence of the last pre-Christian centuries, but in earlier times the situation may have been different. Possibly in those earlier centuries, scrolls were rarely distributed, while the evidence shows that in later periods this was the case. See further the next footnote.

[37] Thus already N. Lohfink in an impressive study of the "deuteronomistic movement": N. Lohfink, "Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung," in *Jeremia und die "deuteronomistische Bewegung"* (ed. W. Gross; BBB 98; Weinheim, 1995) 313–82, esp. 335–47 = idem, *Studien* [see n. 34 above], 65–142 (91–104). This scholar suggests that writing and book culture were not very advanced in the pre-exilic period, and that at that time possibly only a single copy of each Scripture book was available (thus already C. Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1912] 101). This single copy was written and deposited in the temple, and possibly further rewritten there: "Es ist leicht vorstellbar, das sie <die Texte> bisweilen ergänzt und überarbeitet wurden, vor allem, wenn man sie etwa in der Tempelschule im Unterricht brauchte" (p. 338). Lohfink's point of departure is the deuteronomistic composition Deuteronomy–2 Kings, but he speaks also about the Prophets, which in his view also existed only in single copies, preserved by the students of the prophets (p. 340). In any event, at that early period, books were not distributed. The argument of non-distribution of Scripture books among the people had been suggested previously by Haran, who believed that distribution started only with the official acceptance of these books as authoritative. In the words of Haran, "Book-Scrolls," 11 (see n. 3 above), in the pre-exilic period "… the people at large had no direct access

Scripture books were deposited in the temple no longer needs to remain abstract, as it is supported by evidence in Scripture and elsewhere. E. g., Samuel deposited a binding document in the temple: "Samuel expounded to the people the rules of the monarchy (משפט המלוכה), and recorded them in a document that he deposited before the Lord" (1 Sam 10:25). The clearest proof for the depositing of books in the temple is probably the story of Josiah's discovery of a copy of the Torah in the temple, which formed the basis of his reform (2 Kgs 22:8; 23:2, 24; 2 Chr 34:15, 30).[38] In later times, rabbinic literature often mentions "the copy of the Torah (once: three copies) in the temple court."[39] Beyond Israel, the depositing of scrolls in the temple, which runs parallel to the modern concept of publishing, is evidenced for Egypt as early as the third millennium BCE as well as in ancient Greece and Rome. At a later period, rabbinic literature uses the term "written and deposited (כתוב ומונח)" in the temple.[40]

In sum, assuming that the external shape of the earliest scrolls of Hebrew Scripture was no different from that of the Qumran scrolls, we set out to analyze the procedures for writing and rewriting ancient scrolls. We noted that the inscribed area in scrolls was not a flexible entity. In fact, after the scroll was inscribed, there simply was no technical possibility for a scribe to insert any substantial addition into the text or to delete or rewrite segments larger than a few words or a line. We therefore suggested that editors or scribes did not use earlier copies as the basis for their content changes, but instead, constantly created fresh scrolls for expressing their new thoughts. That scribes did not insert their changes in earlier copies is also evident from a comparison of the parallel copies of Qumran sectarian compositions. This understanding should now be taken into consideration in the historico-critical analysis of Hebrew Scripture, since in the past the realia of rewriting were beyond the scholarly horizon. Each layer of rewriting probably involved the penning of a new copy. This hypothesis involves the further assumption of the linear development of Scripture books and probably also the depositing, writing, and rewriting of Scripture scrolls in a central place, viz., the temple.

---

to this literature, which was entrusted to special circles of initiates – priests, scribal schools, prophets, poets trained in the composition of psalmodic poetry and the like."

[38] Whether or not all Scripture books were deposited in the temple is a matter of speculation. In later times, probably all authoritative Scripture books were deposited there, but previously possibly only the legal and historical books Genesis–Kings were placed in the temple.

[39] For a detailed analysis of the evidence, see chapter 12*.

[40] For the evidence see chapter 12*.

Chapter Sixteen

Recording the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Text Editions of Hebrew Scripture

The very first editions of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls were published shortly after their discovery: 1QIsa[a1] and 1QIsa[b].[2] Subsequent single-volume editions included that of 11QpaleoLev[a],[3] but for most Qumran texts the *editio princeps* was in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (of Judah)* series: *DJD* I (Qumran cave 1); II (Murabbaʿat); III (minor caves of Qumran); IV (11QPs[a]), IX, XII, XIV–XVII (all: Qumran cave 4); XXIII (Qumran cave 11). Very few editions were published elsewhere.[4] The *tefillin* and *mezuzot* were published in various additional editions.[5]

The texts found at other sites in the Judean Desert (Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ṣe'elim, Naḥal Ḥever, and Murabbaʿat)[6] were also published in *DJD*, while the Masada texts were published in the Masada series.[7]

At a second stage, the details of the Qumran biblical scrolls were quoted in the various text editions of the Hebrew Bible. As a rule, the Qumran text was quoted directly from the mentioned text editions, and only rarely did the editors of the text editions submit the manuscripts to a new reading. The partial reproduction of details from the scrolls was meant to represent only details that differed from MT. Thus, the only details in the ancient scrolls that were recorded in these text editions were those differing from the medieval text. At the same time, in one recent edition the complete text of the scrolls was quoted in full.[8] Since the recording of textual data is usually centered around the medieval MT, deviations from it, even if antedating that text by as much as 1200 years, were mentioned only in

---

[1] Burrows, *Isaiah*. In due course, this edition was replaced by Parry-Qimron, *Isaiah*.

[2] Sukenik, *'wṣr hmgylwt hgnwzwt*; English version: *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University and Magnes, 1955). The *DJD* edition of the Isaiah scrolls from cave 1 is in preparation (*DJD* XXXII).

[3] D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985).

[4] See chapter 10*, n. 5.

[5] See chapter 10*, n. 6.

[6] For the first three sites, see the texts published by P.W. Flint, M. Morgenstern, and C. Murphy in *DJD* XXXVIII. For the last site, see the texts published by J.T. Milik in *DJD* II.

[7] S. Talmon in *Masada VI,* 1–149.

[8] *Biblia Qumranica*, 2004 (see below).

critical apparatuses.[9] This focus on the medieval text will probably remain the standard in most modern editions. These editions are the focus of this chapter.

1. The first edition to include readings from a scroll was *BH*, which in its third edition (1951) devoted a special apparatus to the Isaiah scrolls from Qumran, at first in a separate fascicle, and subsequently under the text in a third apparatus. In this apparatus, most variants from 1QIsa^{a}, 1QIsa^{b}, and 1QpHab were included, while "peculiarities of purely orthographical or grammatical interest" were excluded.[10]

2. *BHS* contained far fewer variants than *BH*. The editor of Isaiah in *BHS* adduced only the most significant variants, among them readings preferred to MT and readings agreeing with other sources, especially the LXX. All these variants were included in a single apparatus in *BHS*, as compared with three apparatuses in *BH*.

The explanation on p. L of the "General Introduction" to *BHS* does not sufficiently explain which scrolls are covered by the edition. However, this lack of clarity can now be resolved with the aid of the machine-readable version of that apparatus in the *SESB* computer program[11] allowing for advanced searches.[12] It appears that *BHS* includes readings from two Deuteronomy scrolls (4QDeut^{j,q}), 4QSam^{a}, 1QIsa^{a} and 1QIsa^{b}, 4QPs^{b}, and 11QPs^{a}.[13] Coverage of 4QPs^{b} in Psalms 91–118 (see e. g. Ps 102:18, 20) is mentioned on p. L of the "General Introduction," but the unspecified references in the apparatus of other Psalms to a Qumran manuscript actually pertain to the large 11QPs^{a} scroll that is not mentioned in the Introduction. On p. L, reference is also made to quotations from 1QapGen (there is actually only one instance, Gen 14:1), and to 1QM (also one instance, Ps 35:3). On the whole, the treatment of the scrolls in *BHS* is far from satisfactory, which is disappointing in view of the fact that the coverage of the medieval Masoretic manuscripts is rather extensive. In actual fact, by the time *BHS* was published, many additional scrolls had been published and Qumran scholarship had reached a greater sophistication than is visible in the edition.

---

[9] While in text editions of the scrolls the readings of MT and other sources appear in an apparatus to the text (note especially the recording in *DJD*), the situation is reversed in textual editions of the Hebrew Bible, with the readings from the scrolls appearing in the apparatus.

[10] "General Introduction," XXXIX.

[11] In the electronic apparatus, left-hand brackets have systematically been replaced with right-hand brackets, e. g. 1 Sam 10:25 ([למק should be]למק). See also 10:4, 14:50.

[12] *Stuttgarter Elektronische Studienbibel* (ed. C. Hardmeier, E. Talstra, and B. Salzmann; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and the Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap, 2004).

[13] While a note in the introduction to the edition (p. L) leads us to believe that all *DJD* volumes from vol. I onwards are covered, this is actually not the case, as the coverage is limited to the aforementioned scrolls.

3. A more extensive coverage of the scrolls was announced for the edition of the *HUB*.[14] This coverage was described as "practically complete,"[15] covering not only the scrolls from cave 1, but also the *pesharim* and quotations in non-biblical compositions (see p. 33), excluding the cave 4 scrolls that remained unpublished at that time. Phonological and morphological deviations from MT were included.[16]

4. The coverage of the scrolls is more comprehensive and progressively better in each subsequent edition of the *HUB*.[17] When published editions of scrolls or just photographs were available, they were included in the recording of the scrolls. Thus, coverage of the scrolls is exhaustive in the Jeremiah and Ezekiel editions of the *HUB*,[18] but this is not the case in the earlier edition of Isaiah, in which only some of the cave 4 scrolls were recorded on the basis of an examination of photographs and the originals.[19] Following the description in the introductions,[20] coverage of all the details of the manuscripts is complete, including all scribal and most orthographic features, but "reflections of a completely different orthographical and morphological system" as in the case of 2QJer (spellings such as כיא and כוה and forms such as הואה) have not been recorded.[21]

Differences in the recording of sense units (open and closed sections) between the scrolls and MT are recorded in app. II of the *HUB*, such as the addition of a section in 4QJer[a] after Jer 7:29. On the other hand, differences in the length of these intervals (open/closed sections) are not denoted in Isaiah and Jeremiah, while in Ezekiel they are recorded in great detail (pp. xlix–lxi).

The description and recording of variations in sense units in the non-biblical scrolls from Qumran is complete in the Ezekiel edition,[22] while lacking in the editions of Isaiah and Jeremiah.

---

[14] M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition with Introduction* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965).

[15] P. 33. According to Goshen-Gottstein, the *Sample Edition*, in the chapters covered by it (Isaiah 2, 5, 11, 51), represented the first complete collation of the scrolls, being more complete than that of the third edition of *BH*.

[16] Thus p. 33 of the introduction to the *Sample Edition*. However, some orthographic deviations of 1QIsa[a] have not been recorded (Isa 51:12–14).

[17] *HUB*, *Isaiah;* C. Rabin, S. Talmon, and E. Tov, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997); M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and S. Talmon, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Ezekiel* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004).

[18] See the Introduction to Jeremiah, xxviii; Ezekiel, xxix.

[19] *HUB, Isaiah*, Introduction, § 57 (p. xxxvii). Parry–Qimron, *Isaiah* was not yet available at that time.

[20] *HUB, Isaiah*, xxxvi; Jeremiah, xxix; Ezekiel, xxviii.

[21] *HUB, Jeremiah*, Introduction, n. 75: "1QIsa[a] and 4QIsa[c] were treated similarly in the Isaiah volume."

[22] See *HUB, Ezekiel*, Introduction, xxix–xxx.

5. Readings from the scrolls have also been included in so-called eclectic editions, both in the reconstructed original text and in the apparatus.[23] These editions provide merely a selection of variants from the scrolls in the apparatus, although a full recording of such variants could be accommodated within their system. Of the available eclectic editions,[24] only those of Genesis by R. Hendel and of Hosea by P. G. Borbone allow us to examine the coverage of the scrolls, which, in our view, is insufficient. In the text edition of Hosea, some readings from Qumran scrolls have been adopted in the critical text (Hos 2:8–13; 8:6) and in the apparatus,[25] but the importance of that material for the reconstructed original text is not summarized, in contrast to the presence of a detailed summary for each of the medieval manuscripts (pp. 183–227). Likewise, in Hendel's critically reconstructed *Urtext*, the relation of the Qumran fragments to this text is not discussed.[26] However, the reconstructed text and the apparatus do include readings from the scrolls. Thus, in MT in Gen 1:9 the command "let the water under the heaven be gathered into one place, so that dry land may appear"[27] is followed by an short account of its implementation ("and so it was [ויהי כן]"). Hendel's edition, however, contains a full account of the implementation ("and the water under the heaven was gathered into one place, and dry land appeared)[28] following a plus in 4QGen^{k} frg. 1[29] and the LXX.

6. The texts from the Judean Desert are covered in full by *BHQ* (see, e. g., the full coverage of the Canticles scrolls from Qumran),[30] including both significant readings, possibly preferable to MT and/or the LXX, and those that are secondary. The latter type of readings does not contribute towards the reconstruction of the original text of Hebrew Scripture, but illustrates the process of textual transmission. Thus, the full recording includes such misspellings as התנאה in 4QCant^{b} (MT 2:13 התאנה), בשקתי (MT 3:1 בקשתי), described in the apparatus as "metathesis," אבאי (MT 4:8 תבואי), described as "err-graph," and Aramaic forms

---

[23] For the system, see the introduction to the *OHB*: "The Oxford Hebrew Bible: Prologue to a New Critical Edition."

[24] See chapter 18*, n. 47.

[25] The major Qumran manuscripts were not yet available to Borbone (see p. 65).

[26] In Hendel's insightful analysis of the critically reconstructed edition, detailed attention is given to MT, LXX and SP, but the relation of the Qumran fragments to this reconstructed *Urtext* is not reviewed.

[27] ויקוו המים מתחת השמים אל מקום אחד ותראה היבשה.

[28] ותרא היב[שה ויקוו המים מתחת השמים אל מקויהם]. The first preserved word is preceded by a wide margin (intercolumnar margin or the margin at the beginning of a sheet).

[29] The minute fragment consists of a few letters of two words without any context, and their identification as the plus to MT rather than the command of MT itself is not at all certain. For the data, see J. R. Davila, *DJD* XII, 76.

[30] The edition states that it records all variations, including orthographic and morphological differences, such as אקום in 4QCant^{a} for אקומה of MT in Cant 3:2, and מה[אחכם for אחכם of MT in 3:5. However, the following variants are missing: הראני for הריאני in 4QCant^{b} (Cant 2:14) and ירושלים for ירושלם in 4QCant^{a} (Cant 3:10).

such as הטללים (MT 2:17 הצללים) and בשמין (MT 4:10 בשמים). At the same time, deviations from MT in sense division do not receive attention,[31] while the same internal differences in Masoretic manuscripts are recorded in great detail.[32] On the whole, due to the extensive coverage of the scrolls in *BHQ*, this edition can be used profitably as a source of information for the scrolls. At the same time, the reader is overwhelmed with the large amount of information on secondary readings in the scrolls.[33] Since *BHQ* provides value judgments on these readings, that edition could have differentiated graphically between a stratum of possibly valuable readings and a second stratum of clearly secondary readings. From reading the apparatus, one gets the impression that the greater part of the readings belong to this second stratum.

Textual evaluations in *BHQ* are very conservative when compared with earlier editions in the *BH* series.[34]

7. The *Biblia Qumranica* is a different type of edition, recording the complete texts found in the Judean Desert together with the evidence of the other textual witnesses in parallel columns. In the words of the editors, "[t]he *Biblia Qumranica* responds to a paradigm shift in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible … scholars now recognize the textual witnesses of a given biblical book to be literary works in their own right. … an *Urtext* can no longer be identified" (p. ix). This description may be somewhat exaggerated, but *Biblia Qumranica* definitely provides the tools for further analysis of the newly found Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek scrolls, in the wider context of other textual witnesses, with MT (*BHS*) appearing in the first column and the LXX in the last one. The texts from the Judean Desert are copied from the published editions, with the exception of a few new readings by the editors (lists of such differences are provided in the edition itself). Typographical arrangements display the differences between the various columns – indicated in small gray text boxes – with great clarity. This way of exhibiting the differences involves editorial judgment concerning what is considered a difference, plus, and minus element, not only regarding Hebrew texts but also with reference to the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever. In the

[31] They are not mentioned in the "General Introduction," XIV. For example, Cant 3:8 has a closed section in *BHQ*, but that edition does not contain a note about the lack of an interval in 4QCant[a]; Cant 4:3 has an interval in 4QCant[b] (open section), but this fact is not mentioned in *BHQ* which has no interval at that point.

[32] *BHQ* includes only variants in sense divisions that are significant for "translation and exegesis" (see "General Introduction," XIII). On the other hand, a complete table of such intervals in the collated Tiberian manuscripts is included in the introduction to each biblical book.

[33] The data include secondary readings that are relevant only for exegesis and transmission history. In the words of the "General Introduction", "The editors intend that, so far as possible, the apparatus will include all cases of variation in these witnesses that meet two general criteria for inclusion. First, such a variation is judged to be text-critically significant. … Second, it is judged to be potentially significant for translation or exegesis" (p. XIII).

[34] For examples, see chapter 18*, § 3.

latter case, the deviations of that scroll from the OG translation as represented by a modern edition of the LXX (the Göttingen Septuagint)[35] are represented with the same typographical layout. Thus, the reader learns more quickly and easily than in other editions about the differences between the Judean Desert texts and the other texts, including matters of orthography. However, this edition is meant to provide only a fragmentary picture of the biblical text, as its coverage does not go beyond that of the contents of the scrolls. As a result, the use of this edition for studying the running biblical text is limited.

8. An edition combining the various scattered Qumran fragments into a fragmented running text is being planned by E. Ulrich,[36] but in the meantime, its English counterpart is available.[37] This edition translates precisely the contents of all the scrolls into English, as if they were one running text. The editors suggest that *The Dead Sea Scrolls Scriptures* "may be a more historically accurate title for this volume" (p. vii). Be that as it may, the editors realize that the scrolls came from different localities, some of them having been penned at Qumran itself (see p. xvi), but the edition nevertheless creates the impression that the corpus of the Dead Sea Scrolls presents a coherent corpus named *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (name of the book).[38] Hopefully, this collection will not be used or quoted from in such a way that it appears that the Qumran community wrote or used the collection of Hebrew Scripture as presented in this volume.

The reader gets a clear impression of the fragmentary nature of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, since the biblical text is presented in a fragmentary way. Thus Jer 10:10 is presented in translation in the same fragmentary form as found in 4QJer^{a} (= MT), while a footnote denotes that this verse is lacking in 4QJer^{b} (= LXX).[39] In Isaiah, the running text is that of 1QIsa^{a} (see p. 269) which has been preserved in its entirety, while a footnote at the beginning of each chapter denotes which parallel fragments have been preserved for that chapter in other scrolls. For example, in chapter 23, the footnote refers to the preserved verses from 4QIsa^{c} which are quoted in the apparatus. In the notes themselves, individual readings from that scroll are listed, such as "to make … tremble" in 4QIsa^{c} (להרגיז) in Isa 23:11 as opposed to "he has made … tremble" in 1QIsa^{a}, 4QIsa^{a}, MT, and LXX (הרגיז). The notes in this edition guide the reader in understanding which details

[35] J. Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate academiae litterarum gottingensis editum,* XII (2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

[36] E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Bible*, forthcoming. The nature of this edition resembles that of the English version to be described below.

[37] M. Abegg, Jr., P. Flint, E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible, The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).

[38] Details written in the introduction tend to be forgotten if the name of the collection instructs the reader to think otherwise.

[39] In fact, the footnote refers to 4QJer^{a} which represents a misprint.

are relevant to the textual and literary criticism of Hebrew Scripture. Thus in Gen 1:9, the *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* quotes the long addition of 4QGen^{k} as part of the running text of the edition: "[And the waters under the heavens gathered to their gatherings] and the d[ry land] appeared."

It is impossible to represent in English subtle differences between MT and a scroll in several grammatical categories, spelling (defective/plene), alternative forms (שם/שמה, הוא/הואה), final letters/nonfinal letters, scribal corrections, etc. These details are neither translated nor mentioned in the notes.

9. All the biblical manuscripts have been recorded electronically by M. Abegg based on existing standard editions, covering all the texts from the Judean Desert.[40] In this database, each word is accompanied by a morphological analysis, enabling searches on words and grammatical categories. In addition, on the basis of this material a printed concordance, similar to the earlier one,[41] will be published.

At this stage, all the editions referred to remain incomplete, and therefore presently *DJD* may well be the preferred source for the study of the biblical scrolls. However, after the publication of the *Qumran Bible* by E. Ulrich the situation may be different. By the same token, with the completion of the computerized databases, and with the added function of electronic searches on words and grammatical categories, the situation may again be different. It should also be kept in mind that different sets of data are required for different types of examinations. The full recording of the data as in *BHQ* and the *HUB* may suffice for text-critical studies, but for linguistic research the complete text of the scroll must be constantly examined.

As a rule, the *DJD* editions do not contain value judgments ("original" reading, "secondary" reading, mistake, etc.),[42] while *BHQ* contains such judgments, rendering it perhaps more user-friendly to some readers. Judging from the only published fascicles of *BHQ* to date, that edition is rather precise, and may well be used as a shortcut leading to *DJD*. Other users may not be interested in such value judgments. Only *DJD* and *Biblia Qumranica* record the Qumran readings in their full contexts, while *BHQ* and the *HUB* present a fragmented picture of individual readings.

[40] Released in 2007 as a module within the Accordance computer program.

[41] M. G. Abegg, Jr., with J. E. Bowley and E. M. Cook, in consultation with E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance I. The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003).

[42] Editions by F. M. Cross in *DJD* XIV and XVII form an exception.

Chapter Seventeen

The Use of Computers in Biblical Research

Computers provide us with passive tools that are also active and interactive when used as an extension of our own thinking in the study of Scripture. In both areas, individual scholars, projects, and companies have created tools with great potential for searching and researching, but these are greatly under-used for a variety of reasons. There remains a wide gap between the knowledge of the experts creating the tools and that of the scholars for whom the tools are intended. The idea behind these tools is that we scholars continue our investigations as before, but now utilize the additional tools and databases.

Computer programs and databases serve active and passive functions. As passive tools, they serve us just like books, especially text editions, concordances, lexicons, grammars, commentaries, atlases, and encyclopedias. As active tools, programs and databases can be used to improve and expand the areas of our research. We make a distinction between non-flexible computer-assisted research and flexible computer programs and databases. Some very fine computer-assisted research has been presented to the public in a fixed printed form. If perchance a reader wished to retrieve information from the data that the author had not thought of providing, it would be a lost cause, since the reader has no access to the computer data and, in the worst case scenario, the electronic data may no longer be in existence. On the other hand, if a database is available to the public, all questions can be asked at any time.

Twenty years ago, at a computer conference, I stressed that there was a yawning gap between the knowledge of computer experts and that of the public at large,[1] and this is still the case, although much less so. Many scholars and students still do not open an electronic search program with the same ease as a printed concordance, even if the former provides far better results.

In biblical scholarship, computer-assisted studies have focused on the following five areas:

[1] E. Tov, "A New Generation of Biblical Research," in *Proceedings of the First International Colloquium Bible and Computer, The Text, Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgique) 2–3–4 septembre 1985* (Paris: Champion; Geneva: Sladkine, 1986) 413–43.

1. Authorship Studies

Scholars have tried to determine authorship with the aid of statistical analysis of pericopes of 100 words or more, especially outside the realm of biblical scholarship. Statistical analysis was supposed to answer questions such as whether or not two segments of a composition were composed by the author whose name is connected with that composition, and also whether two different compositions were perchance composed by the same author. In our area, pioneering work was performed by Radday et al.[2] The statistics provided by these authors attempted to demonstrate that the only distinction that can be made between the so-called sources of Genesis is that between the Priestly layer P and the combined source JE. This early work by Radday et al. has been criticized much by Krispenz,[3] who herself favors computerized statistical research that is based on different principles.[4] Criticism had been voiced earlier by Forbes who claimed that Radday used the wrong sampling practices for attempting to establish authorship.[5] I note that all these authorship studies are not easily intelligible to those who are not experts in mathematics, and therefore, according to V. Premstaller, cannot be evaluated well.[6]

2. Stylistics

In a long series of studies using the database of the Werkgroep Informatica in Amsterdam, Polak investigated the vocabulary of the Hebrew Bible. One study investigates in particular the relation between the number of verbs in the sentence as opposed to the number of nouns.[7] The author shows that this relation changes in the transition from early to late Hebrew in the Bible and also differs

---

[2] Y. T. Radday and H. Shore, *Genesis, An Authorship Study in Computer-Assisted Statistical Linguistics* (AnBib 103; Rome: Biblical Institute Press; Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1985).

[3] J. Krispenz, *Literarkritik und Stilstatistik im Alten Testament: Eine Studie zur literarkritischen Methode, durchgeführt an Texten aus den Büchern Jeremia, Ezechiel und I Könige* (BZAW 307; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001). See also G. E. Weil et al., "Le livre d'Isaïe et l'analyse critique des sources textuelles," in *Pratique de l'analyse des donneés* (ed. J. P. Benzécri; Paris: Dunod, 1982) 140–60.

[4] Among other things, she criticizes Radday for formulating criteria for linguistic analysis that are meaningful in the analysis of German, but not Hebrew literature. Krispenz also claims (p. 90) that Radday explained away the differences between P on the one hand and J and E on the other by ascribing these differences to different literary genres (*Gattungen*).

[5] A. Dean Forbes, "A Critique of Statistical Approaches to the Isaiah Authorship Problem," in *Association Internationale Bible et Informatique, Actes du Troisième Colloque International* (Paris: Champion; Geneva: Sladkine, 1992) 531–45; idem, "Statistical Research on the Bible," *ABD* (1992) 6.185–206.

[6] V. Premstaller, reviewing the work of Krispenz: http://www.bookreviews.org/.

[7] F. H. Polak, "New Means–New Ends: Scholarship and Computer Data," *Association Internationale Bible et Informatique* 4 (Travaux de Linguistique Quantitative 57; Paris: Slatkine, 1995) 282–312.

between the different literary genres. In another study, Polak investigated the epic formulas used in Scripture.[8]

3. Linguistics

A few traditional linguistic studies involving the analysis of specific words, word-groups, grammatical forms, vocalization patterns, and linguistic features of a biblical book or layer in the Bible have been carried out with the aid of computerized data. These studies mainly advance modern linguistic theories, and not the exegesis of these books.[9]

4. Statistics

Important studies published in printed editions have been carried out by Andersen and Forbes, especially in their book *The Vocabulary of the Old Testament*. This work of 721 large pages involves word counts of all the words in each biblical book, including the Pentateuchal sources and the individual segments of Isaiah and the Psalms (part III), and a list showing the frequency of occurrences of the *binyanim* of all the verbs (part IV). Part I gives the statistical picture of all the grammatical categories appearing in each of the subdivisions of the Bible, such as the number of common nouns appearing in Genesis or in P, without further details.[10] With all its useful information, this book exemplifies the category of non-flexible data, as we cannot view the data behind the numbers given nor ask additional questions from the data.

5. Textual Criticism

A study by Weil lists the number of verses in the Leningrad Codex compared with the Masoretic lists.[11] With the aid of the *Accordance* program, I myself

---

[8] F. H. Polak, "Epic Formulas in Biblical Narrative: Frequency and Distribution, 2" in *Les actes du second colloque internationale Bible et Informatique: mèthodes, outils, résultats (Jerusalem, 9–13 Juin 1988)* (ed. R. Poswick et al.; Geneva: Champion-Slatkine, 1989) 435–88.

[9] I confess to not always understanding the mathematical aspects of many linguistic studies, of which the THLI series (*Textwissenschaft-Theologie, Hermeneutik, Linguistik-Literaturanalyse, Informatik*) edited by H. Schweizer is probably typical. See, e. g., W. Bader, *Simson bei Delila – Computer-linguistische Interpretation des Textes Ri 13–16* (TLHI 3; Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 1991); H. Schweizer, *Die Josefsgeschichte – Konstituierung des Textes* (THLI 4; Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 1991).

[10] For example, this book provides statistics regarding the relation between את and עם in a given book. Thus, the Priestly source prefers את over עם, while the other sources in the Torah display the opposite tendency (p. 28).

[11] G. E. Weil, "Les décomptes de versets, mots et lettres du Pentateuque selon le manuscrit B 19a de Léningrad," *Mélanges D. Barthélemy* (OBO 38; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 651–703.

studied the frequency of the *petuchot* and *setumot* in the various books in the MT.[12]

The study of orthography is a typical example of an area that benefits much from computer-assisted research. Andersen and Forbes analyzed the spelling of word-groups and individual words, providing, for example, data about the spelling of the patterns *qotel*, *qotlim*, and *qotlot* that were not previously available.[13]

The creation of the CATSS database in Philadelphia and Jerusalem brought about a host of studies based on the morphological analysis of the Hebrew and the Greek and on features in the parallel alignment.[14] This project created a flexible multi-purpose database aimed at the study of the LXX and its relation to the MT. The database contains a long list of stereotyped notes on such matters as *Ketiv*/*Qere*, renderings of prepositions, the addition/deletion of pronouns, differences in aspect (active/passive) between the Hebrew and Greek texts, the article, addition/deletion of כל, transliterations, doublets, and interchanges of consonants, many of which have been examined in monographic studies.

Thus I was able to investigate the frequency of the interchanges in consonants between the MT and the LXX[15] and the types of renderings of the infinitive absolute.[16] Nieuwoudt examined aspects of the finite verb;[17] Polak studied the relation between the Samuel scrolls from Qumran and the LXX;[18] Kyung-Rae Kim analyzed the relationship between the LXX and the SP;[19] Knobloch studied the phonology of the transliterations in the LXX,[20] while the literalness of the LXX translation was subjected to scrutiny by Tov and Wright.[21] Marquis studied differences in sequence,[22] and J. Lust analyzed multiple authorship in Ezek-

---

[12] Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 143–66.

[13] F. I. Andersen and D. Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible* (BibOr 41; Rome: Biblical Institute Press; Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1986).

[14] For a bibliography, see Tov, *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 41–3 and R. A. Kraft: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rs/rak/catss.html. See also the description by J. Treat in http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~jtreat/rs/rscpuhx.html.

[15] *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 301–11.

[16] *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 247–56.

[17] B. A. Nieuwoudt, *Aspects of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: The Finite Verb in the Septuagint of Deuteronomy*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., University of Stellenbosch, 1992.

[18] F. H. Polak, "Statistics and Textual Filiation: the Case of 4QSam^a/LXX (with a Note on the Text of the Pentateuch)," in *Manchester Symposium*, 215–76.

[19] Kyung-Rae Kim, *Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994.

[20] F. W. Knobloch, *Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script: Transcriptions and Related Phenomena in the Septuagint, with Special Focus on Genesis*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 1995.

[21] E. Tov and B. G. Wright in Tov, *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 219–37. See also B. G. Wright, "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism' in the LXX," in Cox, *VI Congress*, 311–35.

[22] G. Marquis, "Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel," *Textus* 13 (1986) 59–84.

iel.[23] Further, Polak and Marquis devoted a large study to the classification of the minuses of the LXX vis-à-vis the MT.[24]

Electronic Resources

The list below[25] displays a list of the available electronic resources as known to me in 2006, both as freeware and in commercial software packages (indicated with a star*). Usually the rule is, the more recent the program, the more sophisticated the software. For details pertaining to the description below, the reader is referred to the list.

The Hebrew Bible has been available for some time in machine-readable form, with vowels and accents. The Greek Bible with accents, is also available.

All available sources are designed exclusively for a PC environment except for *Accordance* (Macintosh) and the *Jewish Classics Library* (PC and Macintosh). However, with emulation programs, the PC programs can be used on the Macintosh, and the *Accordance* program can be used on a PC.

The great majority of the software programs of the Hebrew Bible represent the Leningrad Codex or *BHS*. In principle, these two sources should be identical, since *BHS* is based on codex L, but in practice they are not. The main text which is used, the so-called Michigan-Claremont-Westminster text, has been corrected according to codex L. On the other hand, the Bar-Ilan database, *Tokhnit "HaKeter,"* displays the Aleppo Codex, which differs in only a small number of details from codex L, but for students of grammar these differences may be important. No less than fourteen software packages offer the Hebrew Bible text, all reflecting *BHS* or codex L, with the exception of the Bar-Ilan database.[26]

---

[23] J. Lust, "The Computer and the Hypothetic Translators of Ezekiel," in *Proceedings* (see n. 1), 265–74.

[24] F. H. Polak and G. Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint, Part I: Introduction; Part II: The Pentateuch* (CATSS Basic Tools 4.5; Stellenbosch: Print24.com, 2002).

[25] Special thanks are due to R. Brown, R. A. Kraft, and G. Marquis, as well as the late A. Groves, for information provided and criticisms given. The websites by Joel Calvesmaki (http://www.kalvesmaki.com/LXX/) and J. Adair, as part of a service provided by *TC, A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* (http://rosetta.reltech.org/*TC*/*TC.html*) were also helpful. To the best of my knowledge, no printed bibliography exists with the exception of the following sources, which are not very helpful since the data in this field change very rapidly: J. J. Hughes, *Bits, Bytes & Biblical Studies: A Resource Guide for the Use of Computers in Biblical and Classical Studies* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987); I. Lancashire, *The Humanities Computing Yearbook 1989–90: A Comprehensive Guide to Software and Other Resources* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991) 18–31 (Biblical Studies).

[26] In all programs, slight adjustments were made to the appearance of the text since all used different fonts. A. Groves (2003) notes: "The text was first made available for word-processing using the Hebraica font created and distributed (font and text) by Linguist's Software (Phil Payne in Seattle). Until Hebrew Bible search software became available, this was probably the most widely used version in word processing. There are now many word-processing versions of the

The text of the MT is thus available in several commercial software packages bearing such names as *Accordance*, *BibleWorks* [6],[27] the *Jewish Classics Library*, *Logos*, *WordSearch*, *Gramcord*, *Bible Windows*, SESB, and *Global Jewish Database*.

The texts from Qumran are researchable in several programs.

Internal differences between the medieval manuscripts of the MT are only researchable electronically for the few books that have been recorded by the HUBP (part of Isaiah as well as Jeremiah and Ezekiel), but otherwise the differences between them are not researchable on the computer. The Masoretic accents are accessible in *Accordance*, BibleWorks, and in the *Tochnit "HaKeter"* of Bar-Ilan. These programs allow for studies on the frequency of specific accents in the individual books and in the Bible as a whole, their internal sequence and interrelation. Similarly, research can be performed in these programs on the vowels alone, for example, on irregular vocalizations, combinations of vowels and consonants, as well as linguistic patterns, such as the pattern *qetel* or *qittalon* with a wildcard for the *waw* of *qittalon*.

The Masorah Magna and Parva are now available in the Bar-Ilan database.

The Samaritan Pentateuch is available within *Accordance* in the edition of A. Tal,[28] with morphological analysis.

In addition to Hebrew Scripture, ten software packages also contain the LXX as encoded by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (*TLG*) from the edition of A. Rahlfs (1935),[29] without any variant readings. The variants of the LXX have been encoded by CCAT in Philadelphia, though not yet for all books. Other tools available are the text editions by Swete, Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray (1906–1940),[30] and Field (1875),[31] the grammar of Conybeare and Stock (1905),[32] Swete, *Introduction* and modern translations, some of them as scanned images.

The edition of the Vulgate is presently available in nine software sources.[33]

---

text available using fonts produced by the various Bible software companies. Some of the companies have licensed Linguist's Software. The most common of which I am aware are: Hebraica I & II and the New Jerusalem font (Linguist's Software), the BibleWorks font, the BibleWindows font, SuperHebrew (I think the predecessor to Hebraica?) and the Gramcord font. Then there is SIL's font (called SIL Ezra; public domain). I also think that SBL has produced a public domain font. Anyway, these are the fonts I see from my various students. Note that each of these fonts map the Hebrew a little differently, so the vendor has revised our text for use with their fonts. Which means that a text in a particular font is not easily converted to another font." In addition, Accordance uses its own fonts (Yehudit).

[27] See a detailed review of this package in: http://www.bibfor.de/archiv/02-2.schmidl.htm.

[28] Tal, *Samaritan Pentateuch*.

[29] Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

[30] Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[31] Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[32] Boston: Ginn and Company.

[33] For the history of the encoding of the Vulgate text and for further sites, see the data provided by R. A. Kraft in http://www.le.ac.uk/elh/grj1/linksa.html.

The Targumim as well as the Peshitta are available in several sources, foremost on the website of the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (CAL), together with lexicographical facilities and search capacities.[34]

The key to the effective use of any software program of Scripture texts is the availability in the background of a lemmatization and of a morphological analysis (grammatical tagging) of all the Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, and Syriac text words. This lemmatization allows for a search of all the text words as well as for producing concordances.[35] While word searches are available in several programs, *Accordance* is probably the only one that enables the creation of complete concordances. Such concordances can be produced for any text range so defined: any combination of biblical books or parts thereof, combinations of verses, pericopes, or selections, such as the deuteronomistic verses, Wisdom literature, or late biblical prose or poetry. The defining of such ranges is subjective, and can be changed at any given moment. The search facilities of the various programs differ; some are more sophisticated than others. The most sophisticated programs, *Accordance* and *BibleWorks*, also allow for the search of morphological features, such as the frequency of the individual *binyanim* of the verb and unusual nominal forms, and also the search for combinations of lexical and grammatical information. The morphological and lexical information in the background of *Accordance* also allows for grammatical and orthographical studies on the Qumran texts.

Although these morphological analyses usually follow one central source, such as the lexicon of Köhler-Baumgarten in the case of Hebrew Scripture, they are subjective, and a word that one scholar considers a noun, may be considered by another to be a verb. One scholar may ascribe a given form to the *niph'al*, while another one considers it to be a *hitpa'el*. One source discerns one main meaning of *dever*, while another differentiates between two homographs. *Accordance* probably places too many groups of words under the heading of "particle." This subjectivity comes to light when one reviews the differences between the existing morphological analyses.

The morphological analyses that are at the base of the software packages should be considered separate entities since they derived from independent sources. Seven different morphological analyses of Hebrew Scriptures are based on codex L / *BHS*. These include the *Westminster Hebrew Old Testament Morphology* of Groves-Wheeler, available in at least five software packages, the *Werkgroep Informatica* (including syntax and clause hierarchy) from Amsterdam, the Bar-Ilan analysis, the analysis of the Academy of the Hebrew Language, as well as additional commercial and private morphological analyses. For the LXX, I

[34] Based mainly on *Mikra'ot Gedolot "HaKeter"* (Bar-Ilan University Press, 1992–2000) as well as on various editions. For details, see http://call.cn.huc.edu/ searching/targum_info.html.

[35] See http://www.balboa-software.com/semcomp/scbible2.htm for H. Hahne's descriptions of these aspects in "Using a Computer in Biblical and Theological Studies, Lesson 6: Computer-Assisted Bible Study, Part 2."

know of just one such analysis, that of CATSS-Taylor-Wheeler, which is available in seven different software packages. For the Targumim, there is the analysis of CAL, while for the Vulgate there is no such analysis, so searching in that translation is rather restricted. In addition, four different morphological analyses exist for the non-biblical Qumran texts.

The availability of different lemmatizations enlarges the search facilities, since different lemmatizations and grammatical decisions yield different results. Accordingly, differences relating to exactly the same search executed in different software packages may derive from (1) differences in the base text, among them errors; (2) differences in tagging words[36] and determining of lemmas; (3) differences due to the capabilities and assumptions of the software. In an example given by H. Hahne (n. 35), the different programs provide differing numbers for the occurrences of the pair of Greek particles μέν and δέ.

The bilingual CATSS database, in *Accordance*, allows examination of Greek-Hebrew equivalences, select features in translation technique, and searches of Hebrew or Greek grammatical features.

The list below records the available sources (commercial products [indicated with a star*] and freeware) relevant to textual criticism as of 2006.[37]

I. Source Texts of the Hebrew Bible

MT, Codex Leningrad B19^{A}/*Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia*

1. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
3. Jewish Classics Library* (Davka Company)
   http://www.davka.com/
4. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/details/1981
5. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
6. WordSearch [7]*
   http://www.wordsearchbible.com/
7. Gramcord for Windows* (Gramcord Institute)
   http://www.gramcord.org/

[36] Hahne (n. 35) compared a few software packages for the New Testament. Thus, some programs classify καί as an adverb, while others classify it as a conjunction.

[37] In this area, data change constantly, and the use of a web search engine such as google.com may provide additional information on new projects and products. Use of the search facility in google.com under "images" provides further links under such headings as "Septuagint," "Dead Sea Scrolls," and "Hebrew manuscripts." For a helpful new site, see http://www.hum.huji.ac.il/Dinur/links/texts heb.htm.

8. Bible Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.silvermnt.com/bwinfo.htm
9. Global Jewish Database* (Responsa Project, CD-ROM 12, Bar-Ilan University) (with cross-references to Rabbinic Literature)
   http://www.biu.ac.il/JH/Responsa/index.html
10. Translator's Workplace [4.0] (private software package of the Summer Institute for Linguistics [SIL])
    http://www.sil.org/
11. Bible Companion (restricted use)
    http://www.biblecompanion.com/
12. DBS International Corporation* (probably *BHS*)
    http://www.dbs123.com/
13. *Mechon Mamre*
    http://www.mechon-mamre.org/i/t/t0.htm
14. Snunit
    http://kodesh.snunit.k12.il
15. Westminster Hebrew Institute in: *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*, Brigham Young University, Revised Edition, 2006; part of the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library of E. J. Brill Publishers (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2006)*

MT, Codex Leningrad B19A: scanned images

West Semitic Research Project (private)
http://www.usc.edu/dept/LAS/wsrp/

MT, Aleppo Codex

1. *Tokhnit "HaKeter"–Ma'agar HaTanakh*, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan; part of the *Miqraot Gedolot "HaKeter"* Project* (in books in which the Codex is missing, its text has been reconstructed according to sources close to the Aleppo Codex)
2. *http://aleppocodex.org/flashopen.html* (scanned pages)

MT, Masoretic Accents

1. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software) (BHS-W4)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. *Tokhnit "HaKeter"–Ma'agar HaTanakh**, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan

MT, Aleppo Codex, Masorah Magna and Parva

*Tokhnit "HaKeter"–Ma'agar HaTanakh**, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan; part of the *Miqraot Gedolot "HaKeter"* Project*, version 2 (2005)

Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert

1. Dead Sea Scrolls Publication Project (Jerusalem; Notre Dame) (private, all texts published after 1990)
2. Database of J. Cook, Stellenbosch (private, incomplete)
3. Qumran database of S. Pfann (Logos, announced)
4. *Biblia Qumranica* (in preparation; private, incomplete)

5. Large Isaiah scroll, scanned images (F. P. Miller)
   http://www.ao.net/~fmoeller/qumdir.htm
   http://www.imj.org.il
6. Accordance [7.1]*
   http://www.oaksoft.com/ (OakTree Software)

Samaritan Pentateuch

1. Edition of Tal, *Samaritan Pentateuch*
   Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. Edition using Samaritan fonts on the basis of "Rylands Sam. MS 1 with Chester Beatty and Cambridge 1846" (private: A. Crown)
3. Edition of A. F. von Gall, *Der Hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1914–1918), scanned images: TC Ebind Index
   http://rosetta.reltech.org/Ebind/docs/TC/

Ben Sira, Hebrew, medieval manuscripts

1. *Ma'agarim**, CD-ROM of the Academy of the Hebrew Language
   http://hebrew-academy.huji.ac.il/
2. P. C. Beentjes, Utrecht (private)
3. Accordance [7.1]*
   http://www.oaksoft.com/ (OakTree Software)

II. Source Texts of Ancient Versions

LXX, Codex S: scanned images

Edition of C. von Tischendorf, *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus* (Leipzig: Giesecke et Devrient, 1862): TC Ebind Index: *http://rosetta. reltech.org/Ebind/docs/TC/*

LXX, Codex W: scanned images

Edition of H. A. Sanders, *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of Deuteronomy and Joshua in the Freer Collection* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1910), and idem, *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1927): TC Ebind Index:
http://rosetta.reltech.org/Ebind/docs/TC/

Greek Scripture, Papyri

1. Duke Papyrus Archive
   http://odyssey.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/
2. APIS
   http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/projects/digital/apis/
3. P.Oxy
   http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk

4. Database of R. A. Kraft (links to the major early witnesses of the LXX, usually with images)
   http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rs/rak/jewishpap.html
5. The Perseus Digital Library (in all these: search for "Septuagint," "LXX," "Bible," etc.)
   http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/

LXX, edition of A. Rahlfs (Stuttgart, 1935) (encoded by TLG)

1. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
3. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/details/1981/
4. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
5. Gramcord for Windows* (Gramcord Institute)
   http://www.gramcord.org/
6. Bible Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.silvermnt.com/bwinfo.htm
7. CCAT
   http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/
8. Bible Companion (restricted use)
   http://www.biblecompanion.com/
9. University of British Columbia
   http://www.cnrs.ubc.ca/index.php?id=3560
10. Websites, see:
    http://www.kalvesmaki.com/LXX/

LXX, edition of H. B. Swete: scanned images

Christian Classics Ethereal Library
http://www.ccel.org/s/swete/index.html

LXX, edition of Brooke-McLean, scanned images

TC Ebind Index
http://rosetta.reltech.org/Ebind/docs/TC/

LXX, variants, Göttingen and Cambridge editions (incomplete)

CCAT
http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/

LXX, Hexapla, edition of F. Field (Oxford, 1875): scanned images

TC Ebind Index
http://rosetta.reltech.org/Ebind/docs/TC/

LXX, Swete, *Introduction*: scanned images

1. CCEL
   http://ccel.org/s/swete/greekot/
2. TC Ebind Index
   http://rosetta.reltech.org/Ebind/docs/TC/

LXX, grammar: F. C. Conybeare and St. G. Stock (Boston: Ginn, 1905)

1. CCEL (scanned images)
   http://ccel.org/c/conybeare/greekgrammar/
2. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/

LXX, grammar: Thackeray, *Grammar*

Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software, in preparation)
http://www.oaksoft.com/

LXX, translations into English

a. Brenton's translation, without the Deutero-canonical books
1. Boston Christian Bible Study Resources
   http://www.bcbsr.com/topics/olb.html
2. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
3. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/

b. NETS
http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/

LXX, translation into French

http://epelorient.free.fr/

LXX, translation into German

Septuaginta Deutsch
http://www.septuaginta-deutsch.de/

LXX, translations into modern languages: work in progress

http://www.kalvesmaki.com/LXX/

Vetus Latina

Vetus Latina Institut, Beuron*
http://www.brepolis.net/login/overview.cfm#

Vulgate: Edition of R. Weber (Stuttgart, 1969, 1983)

1. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/details/1981
2. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
3. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
4. Bible Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.silvermnt.com/bwinfo.htm
5. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
6. Bible Gateway.com
   http://www.catholic.net/RCC/Catechism/bible.html
7. The Internet Sacred Text Archive
   http://www.sacred-texts.com/
8. Unbound Bible
   http://unbound.biola.edu/
9. *www.biblegateway.com*

Targumim

CAL (Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon)
http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/

Targum Onkelos

1. Global Jewish Database (12)*
   http://www.accordancebible.com/
2. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
3. CCAT/PHI CD-ROM (1987) (text encoded by M. Grossfeld, Wisconsin)
4. *http://books.google.com/books?vid=ISBN9004140387&printsec=toc#PPP1,M1* (edition of Sperber)

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

1. CCAT/PHI CD-ROM (1987) (text encoded by E. G. Clarke, Toronto)
2. Accordance [6.4]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/

Targum Jonathan

1. DBS International Corporation*
   http://www.dbs123.com/
2. Accordance [7.1]* (in preparation; OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
3. *http://books.google.com/books?vid=ISBN9004140387&printsec=toc#PPP1,M1* (edition of Sperber)

Targum to Job

CCAT/PHI CD-ROM (1987) (text encoded in Oxford)

Targum Neophyti

1. CCAT/PHI CD-ROM (1987) (text encoded by M. Sokoloff)
2. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/

Targumim, Pseudo-Jonathan and Onkelos, translations

Translation of J. W. Etheridge (1862)
http://www.tulane.edu/~ntcs/pj/psjon.htm

Targumim to the *megillot* and Psalms

http://www.tulane.edu/~ntcs/tgtext.htm

Targumim from Qumran

CAL (private)
http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/

Peshitta

1. CAL (most books)
   http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/
2. Peshitta Institute, Leiden (private)
   http://www.leidenuniv.nl/gg/
   For progress reports see also *Hugoye*:
   http://syrcom.cua.edu/Hugoye/
3. Project of W. Strothmann, Göttingen University, discontinued (complete Peshitta, including morphological analyses and concordances).
   http://www.gwdg.de/~mzumpe/strothm.htm

Peshitta, codex A: scanned images

Edition of A. M. Ceriani, *Translatio Syro Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano* (Milan, 1876–1881):

TC Ebind Index
http://rosetta.reltech.org/Ebind/docs/TC/

MT (*BHS*) and LXX (ed. Rahlfs) compared in parallel alignment

1. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. CCAT (ASCII format)
   http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/
3. CATSS, Ben-Sira (in preparation; private: B. G. Wright and G. Marquis)

4. CATSS, programs for the use of: J. Lust (private) [merging of the text file and the morphological analysis]
5. CATSS, analysis of minuses of the LXX (private: F. Polak and G. Marquis)
6. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/

III. Modern Translations of Hebrew Scripture

1. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
3. Jewish Classics Library* (Davka Company)
   http://www.davka.com/
4. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
5. Gramcord for Windows* (Gramcord Institute)
   http://www.gramcord.org/
6. Bible Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.silvermnt.com/bwinfo.htm
7. Nelson's eBible*
   http://www.discountchristian.com/ebible_plat.html
8. Unbound Bible (allows searches in many translations in several languages)
   http://unbound.biola.edu/
9. Blue Letter Bible (allows for comparative searches in the KJV and dictionaries)
   http://blueletterbible.org/links.html
10. SESB*
    http://www.logos.com/products/details/1981
11. Modern translations are presented in countless websites.

IV. Critical Apparatuses

BHS

1. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products
2. Accordance [7.1]*
   http://www.oaksoft.com/ (OakTree Software)

HUBP

HUBP (private): Isaiah 45 ff., Jeremiah, Ezekiel

Göttingen Septuagint

Septuaginta Unternehmen (private): Joshua, Daniel

Biblia Hebraica Quinta (in preparation)

Novum Testamentum Graece (Nestle-Aland)

1. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/
2. Accordance [7.1]*
   http://www.oaksoft.com/ (OakTree Software)

V. Morphological Analyses

Hebrew Scripture

1. Groves-Wheeler Westminster Hebrew Old Testament Morphology
a. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
b. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
c. Gramcord for Windows* (Gramcord Institute)
   http://www.gramcord.org/
d. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
e. CCAT (ASCII format)
   http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/
2. Werkgroep Informatica (including syntax and clause hierarchy)
   http://www.th.vu.nl/~wiweb/
   Available in SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/
3. *Tokhnit "HaKeter"–Ma'agar HaTanakh**, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan; part of the *Miqraot Gedolot* "*HaKeter*" Project*
4. Global Jewish Database*
   http://www.biu.ac.il/JH/Responsa/index.html
5. *Ma'agarim**, CD-ROM of the Academy of the Hebrew Language
   http://hebrew-academy.huji.ac.il/
6. Database of F. Andersen and D. Forbes (private)
7. Database of CIB/Maredsous (*Mikrah)* (private: R. F. Poswick, Maredsous)

Greek Scripture: CATSS, Morphologically Analyzed LXX text (*http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/*). Accessible, with corrections by D. Wheeler (version 2.2), in

1. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/details/1981
2. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
3. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
4. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
5. Gramcord for Windows* (Gramcord Institute)
   http://www.gramcord.org/

6. Bible Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.silvermnt.com/bwinfo.htm
7. CCAT (ASCII format)
   http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/

Targumim and Peshitta

CAL (allows on-line lexical and concordance searches)
http://cal1.cn.huc.edu/

All Hebrew texts from the Bible until the 11th century

*Ma'agarim**, CD-ROM of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (based on fresh readings of manuscripts as well as critical editions).

VI. Tools

Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar

Logos* (Logos Research Company)
http://www.logos.com/

BDB

1. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. Gramcord for Windows* (Gramcord Institute)
   http://www.gramcord.org/
3. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
4. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
5. Translator's Workplace
   http://www.sil.org/
6. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/details/1981

L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner and J. J. Stamm, *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, trans. and ed. under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson

1. CD-ROM [Brill, Leiden]
2. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
3. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
4. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/

LSJ together with LSJ, *Supplement* and P. G. W. Glare, *Revised Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996)

1. The Perseus Digital Library (includes links to other lexicons, and provides links to all the texts)
   http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/
2. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
3. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
4. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
5. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/details/1981

J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, I–II (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992, 1996)

1. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/details/1981
3. Gramcord for Windows* (Gramcord Institute)
   http://www.gramcord.org/

G. Kittel (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (trans. G. W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968–1976), abridged edition

1. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
2. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
3. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/

Anchor Bible Dictionary (ed. D. N. Freedman; New York and London: Doubleday, 1992)

1. * CD-ROM
2. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
3. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/

Bible Atlas

1. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/

PhotoGuide (linked with text files)

Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
http://www.oaksoft.com/

W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, W. D. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (2d ed., Chicago and London, 1979; 3d ed., 2000)

1. Accordance [7.1]* (OakTree Software)
   http://www.oaksoft.com/
2. BibleWorks for Windows [7.0]*
   http://www.bibleworks.com/
3. Logos* (Logos Research Company)
   http://www.logos.com/
4. Translator's Workplace [4.0]
   http://www.sil.org/
5. SESB*
   http://www.logos.com/products/details/1981

Chapter Eighteen

Hebrew Scripture Editions: Philosophy and Praxis*

1. Background

The tens of different Hebrew Scripture editions[1] and hundreds of modern translations in various languages are more or less identical, but they differ in many large and small details. Yet, in spite of these differences, all these sources are known as "the Bible." The differences among the Hebrew editions pertain to the following areas: (a) the text base, (b) exponents of the text presentation, and (c) the overall approach towards the nature and purpose of an edition of Hebrew Scripture. In this chapter, we will evaluate the philosophies behind the various text editions and outline some ideas for a future edition.

Behind each edition is an editor who has determined its parameters. Usually such an editor is mentioned on the title page, but sometimes he acts behind the scenes, in which case the edition is known by the name of the printer or place of appearance.

The differences among Hebrew editions pertain to the following areas:

a. *The text base, sometimes involving a combination of manuscripts, and, in one case, different presentations of the same manuscript*.[2] These differences pertain to words, letters, vowels, accents, and *Ketiv/Qere* variations. Usually the differences between the editions are negligible regarding Scripture content, while they are more significant concerning the presence or absence of *Ketiv/Qere* variations. Equally important are differences in verse division (and accordingly in their numbering).[3] In the case of critically restored texts ("eclectic editions"),[4] differences between editions are by definition substantial. In addition to these varia-

* Thanks are due to Prof. J. S. Penkower of Bar-Ilan University for his critical reading of my manuscript and offering several helpful suggestions.

[1] For surveys, see Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 779–976; C. Rabin, "מקרא, דפוסי המקרא," *EncBib* 5:368–86; N. H. Snaith, "Bible, Printed Editions (Hebrew)," *EncJud* 4.836–41.

[2] Codex Leningrad B19^A is presented differently in the following editions: *BH* (1929–1951), *BHS* (1967–1976), Adi (1976), Dotan (2001), and *BHQ* (2004–). *BH*, *BHS*, and *BHQ* are referred to as "the *BH* series."

[3] See J. S. Penkower, "Verse Divisions in the Hebrew Bible," *VT* 50 (2000) 378–93.

[4] See below, § 2 f.

tions, most editions also introduced a number of mistakes and printing errors, reflecting an additional source of divergence.[5]

b. *The exponents of text presentation, partly reflecting manuscript evidence*: the presentation of the text in prose or poetry (in the *BH* series often against codex L),[6] details in the chapter division,[7] the sequence of the books,[8] the inclusion of the Masorah and details in the Masoretic notation (i. a., *Ketiv/Qere*, sense divisions).[9]

c. *Editorial principles pertaining to small details in the text*,[10] *as well as to major decisions*: the inclusion of the traditional Jewish commentators,[11] of ancient or modern translations, and of a critical apparatus of variants. Editorial principles are also reflected in liberties taken in small changes in the base text(s) or the combination of base texts.[12] Some of these conceptions are closely connected with the intended readership (confessional/scholarly). The major decision for a modern editor pertains to the choice of base text, which could be a single manuscript, a group of manuscripts, or the adherence to "tradition," which implies following in some way or other the Second Rabbinic Bible (RB2). The principle of accepting a base text of any type is considered conservative when compared with "eclectic" editions in which readings are deliberately chosen from an unlimited number of textual sources, and in which emendation is allowed (§ 2e below). With most editions being either Jewish or scholarly, one's first intuition would be to assume that the difference between the two would be that the former adhere to tradition, and the latter to scholarly principles, among them the precise representation of a single source. However, precision is not necessarily a scholarly principle, just as adherence to tradition is not necessarily linked with religious beliefs. Thus, not only Jewish editions but also several scholarly editions (among them the first

[5] For some examples, see *TCHB*, 7–8 and the study by Cohen-Freedman quoted in n. 29 below. Many mistakes are found in the 1477 edition of the Psalms quoted in n. 20.

[6] The presentation of the text as either prose or poetry bears on exegesis, for example in the analysis of Jeremiah (cf. the prophecies in prose in most of chapter 7 as opposed to v 29 in that chapter and the surrounding chapters, all presented as poetry).

[7] E. g., Gen 30:25 appears in some editions as 31:1, 31:55 appears as 32:1, and Ezek 13:24 as 14:1. For details, see *TCHB*, 4–5 and J. S. Penkower, "The Chapter Divisions in the 1525 Rabbinic Bible," *VT* 48 (1998) 350–74.

[8] Editions differ regarding the place of Chronicles and the internal sequence of Job-Proverbs-Psalms and the Five Scrolls.

[9] For some examples and bibliography, see my *TCHB*, 6–8.

[10] For example, the presentation of the *ga'yot* (secondary stresses) and the presentation of some elements as either one or two words, such as Gen 14:1 כדרלעמר (*Miqra'ot G^{e}dolot*, Ginsburg 1926; Koren 1966; Adi) as opposed to כדר-לעמר (Letteris, Ginsburg after 1926, Breuer, *BH*, *BHS*).

[11] These commentators are included in the Rabbinic Bible (see below) as well as some additional editions.

[12] See, among other things, below, § 2c.

edition of the *Biblia Hebraica*[13]) follow RB2, while among the modern Jewish (Israeli) editions several are based on a single codex.[14]

As a result of these divergences, there are no two editions that agree in all their details,[15] except for photographically reproduced editions or editions based on the same electronic[16] (computer-encoded) text.

Modern translations differ from one another in many of the text base parameters mentioned above[17] and much more. Thus, the interpretations and styles of the translations differ greatly, and their language may be solemn, modern, or even popular.

2. Development of Editorial Conceptions

Editorial concepts have changed over the course of the centuries.[18] The following approaches are presented more or less in chronological sequence.

a. No Exact Indication of the Source

Virtually all Jewish[19] editions of Hebrew Scripture, with the exception of eclectic editions, are based on manuscripts of MT,[20] more precisely TMT[21] (the Tiberian MT).[22] As the Masoretic manuscripts differed from one another, the very first

---

[13] Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1905, ed. R. Kittel.

[14] Adi (1976) and Dotan (2001) (both: codex L). See also below regarding the editions of Breuer and the *Jerusalem Crown*.

[15] Some editions differ from each other in their subsequent printings (which sometimes amount to different editions), without informing the reader. Note, for example, the differences between the various printings of the editions of Letteris and Snaith resulting from the removal of printing errors.

[16] Computerized versions of Hebrew Scripture, usually accompanied by a morphological analysis of all the words in the text, are almost always based on codex L or *BHS* which in principle should be identical, but in practice are not. For details, see the lists in chapter 17*.

[17] These translations usually follow MT with or without a selection of readings from other sources. For an analysis, see chapter 8*.

[18] For an insightful description of the thinking process behind several editions, see M. Goshen-Gottstein, "Editions of the Hebrew Bible – Past and Future," in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane, E. Tov, and W. Fields; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992) 221–42.

[19] This definition excludes the Samaritan Pentateuch.

[20] Even the first edition of the Psalter ([Bologna?], 1477) should be described as reflecting MT, although it lacks 108 verses and differs often from MT in words and letters. See Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 789.

[21] The term was coined by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein (ed.), *Mikraot Gedolot*, *Biblia Rabbinica, A Reprint of the 1525 Venice Edition* (Jerusalem: Makor, 1972) 5–16.

[22] Some editions are based on the Masoretic Text according to the Babylonian tradition. Thus the Yemenite "Tag" of the Torah, ספר כתר תורה, contains for each verse MT, Targum Onkelos, and Saadya's Arabic Translation (Jerusalem: S. H. Tsukerman, 1894). In practice the content of

editors and printers needed to decide on which source(s) their editions should be based (see below). The perception that an edition should be based on a single manuscript, and preferably the oldest one, had not yet developed, as had not the understanding that the choice of readings from several manuscripts requires the indication of the source of each reading. When the first editions were prepared, based on a number of relatively late Masoretic manuscripts, the earlier manuscripts that were to dominate twentieth century editions (codices L and A) were not known to the editors or recognized as important sources.

The first printed edition of the complete biblical text appeared in 1488 in Soncino, a small town in the vicinity of Milan. Particularly important for the progress of subsequent biblical research were the so-called Polyglots, or multilingual editions,[23] followed by the Rabbinic Bibles (later to be called *Miqra'ot G^{e}dolot*, "folio edition"), which included traditional Jewish commentaries and Targumim.[24]

These editions were based on several *unnamed* manuscripts, to which the editors applied their editorial principles. The editors of RB1 and RB2 derived their base text from "accurate Spanish manuscripts" close to the "accurate Tiberian manuscripts" such as L and A.[25] In the words of Goshen-Gottstein, "[w]ith a view to the fact that this is the first eclectic text arranged in the early sixteenth century, it seems amazing that, until the twentieth century, this early humanistic edition served as the basis for all later texts."[26]

b. Adherence to the Second Rabbinic Bible (RB2)

Because of the inclusion of the Masorah, Targumim, and the traditional Jewish commentaries in RB2, that edition was hailed as *the* Jewish edition of the Hebrew Bible. RB2 also became the pivotal text in scholarly circles since any

---

the Yemenite Torah tradition is identical to that of the Aleppo Codex. See J. S. Penkower, *New Evidence for the Pentateuch Text in the Aleppo Codex* (Heb.; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1992) 62–73.

[23] The later Polyglot editions present in parallel columns the biblical text in Hebrew (MT and SP), Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, Latin, and Arabic, accompanied by Latin versions of these translations and by grammars and lexicons of these languages, while the earlier ones present a smaller range of texts. The first Polyglot is the Complutensum prepared by Cardinal Ximenes in Alcala (in Latin: Complutum), near Madrid, in 1514–1517. The second Polyglot was prepared in Antwerp in 1569–1572, the third in Paris in 1629–1645, and the fourth, the most extensive of all, was edited by B. Walton and E. Castellus, in London, in 1654–1657.

[24] The first two Rabbinic Bibles (RB) were printed at the press of Daniel Bomberg in Venice, the earlier one (RB1, 1516–1517) edited by Felix Pratensis and the later (RB2, 1524–1525) by Jacob Ben-Ḥayyim ben Adoniyahu. For a modern edition of the *Miqra'ot G^{e}dolot,* see Cohen, *Miqra'ot Gedolot "Haketer"*.

[25] Thus J. S. Penkower, *Jacob Ben-Ḥayyim and the Rise of the Biblia Rabbinica*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1982 (Heb. with Eng. summ.); idem, "Rabbinic Bible," in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. J. H. Hayes; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999) 2.361–4 (363).

[26] Goshen-Gottstein, "Editions," 224 (see n. 18 above).

text considered to be central to Judaism was accepted as authoritative elsewhere. Consequently, for many generations following the 1520s, most new editions reflected RB2, and deviated from it only when changing or adding details on the basis of other manuscripts, editorial principles, or when removing or adding printing errors.

Ever since the 1520s, many good, often precise, editions have been based on RB2.[27] The influence of RB2 is felt to this day, as the edition of Koren, probably the one most frequently used in Israel, is based on that source.

The aforementioned Polyglot editions, though influential for the course of scholarship in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, did not continue to influence subsequent Bible editions or Bible scholarship.

c. Adherence to the Ben-Asher Tradition

RB2 became the leading edition because of its status within Judaism and the scholarly world, not because of its manuscript basis which remains unknown (although its type has been recognized). The uncertainty regarding the textual base of these editions is problematic for precise scholarship, and therefore several new editions have tried to improve upon RB2 in various ways.[28] Sometimes readings were changed according to specific Masoretic manuscripts (e. g., J. D. Michaelis [1720] and N. H. Snaith [1958] following B. M. Or 2626–8[29]). At the same time, since all these editions reflect the Ben-Asher text, the centrally accepted text in Judaism, the recognition developed that any new edition should involve an exact representation of that tradition. Thus S. Baer and F. Delitzsch attempted to reconstruct the Ben-Asher text on the basis of, among other things, Ben-Asher's grammatical treatise *Diqduqqê ha-Ṭᵉamim*,[30] particularly with regard to the system of *gaʿyot* (secondary stresses). C. D. Ginsburg (1926) tried to get closer to the original form of the Ben-Asher text on the basis of his thorough knowledge of the notations of the Masorah. At the same time, the edition itself reproduces RB2. Cassuto (1958) hoped to reach the same goal by changing details in an earlier

[27] The most important are those of J. Buxtorf (1618), J. Athias (1661), J. Leusden (2d ed. 1667), D. E. Jablonski (1699), E. van der Hooght (1705), J. D. Michaelis (1720), A. Hahn (1831), E. F. C. Rosenmüller (1834), M. H. Letteris (1852), the first two editions of *BH* (Leipzig 1905, 1913), C. D. Ginsburg (1926), and M. Koren (1962). The dates mentioned refer to the first editions, subsequently followed by revisions and new printings.

[28] See Goshen-Gottstein, "Editions," 221–6 (see n. 18 above).

[29] However, the Snaith edition did not follow the British Museum manuscript exactly, as pointed out in detail by M. B. Cohen and D. B. Freedman, "The Snaith Bible: A Critical Examination of the Hebrew Bible Published in 1958 by the British and Foreign Bible Society," *HUCA* 45 (1974) 97–132.

[30] S. Baer-F. Delitzsch, *Textum masoreticum accuratissime expressit, e fontibus Masorae varie illustravit, notis criticis confirmavit* (Leipzig: Bernard Tauchnitz, 1869–1894).

edition (that of Ginsburg) on the basis of some readings in the Aleppo Codex which he consulted on the spot.

Only in later years did the search for the most precise Bible text lead scholars to use manuscripts presumably vocalized by Aaron ben Moshe ben Ben-Asher *himself* (the Aleppo Codex = A), or those corrected according to that manuscript (Codex Leningrad $B19^A$ = L), or codex C, there being no better base for our knowledge of the Ben-Asher tradition.[31]

The first single manuscript to be used for an edition was codex L[32] from 1009 that was used for the third edition of *BH* (1929–1937, 1951),[33] *BHS* (1967–1977), two editions by A. Dotan (Adi [1976] and Dotan [2001]), and *BHQ* (2004–). The great majority of computer programs using a biblical text are also based on this manuscript (see n. 16).

The second manuscript used for an edition is the Aleppo Codex[34] (vocalized and accented in approximately 925 CE),[35] used for the *HUB*.[36] The lost readings of this manuscript (in the Torah) have been reconstructed on the basis of new evidence by J. S. Penkower[37] and had previously been included in the editions

[31] For a good summary of these tendencies among editors, see J. S. Penkower, "Ben-Asher, Aaron ben Moses," *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (see n. 25) 1.117–9. The colophon of codex C states that the manuscript was vocalized by Aharon Ben-Asher's father, Moshe Ben-Asher. However, recent scholarship suggests that this colophon was copied from the original manuscript that was vocalized by Moshe Ben-Asher. See J. Penkover, "A Pentateuch Fragment from the Tenth Century Attributed to Moses Ben-Asher (Ms Firkowicz B 188)," *Tarbiz* 60 (1991) 355–70.

[32] Facsimile editions: D. S. Loewinger, *Twrh nby'ym wktwbym, ktb yd lnyngrd* $B19^A$ (Jerusalem: Makor, 1970); *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition* (ed. D. N. Freedman; Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge and Leiden/New York/Cologne: Eerdmans/E. J. Brill, 1998). This text is also used in the Hebrew Scripture module in most computer programs; see n. 16.

[33] The term "seventh edition" (see title page and p. XXXIX) is misleading, as the earlier *BHS* is considered to be the fourth edition and *BHQ* the fifth. The term probably refers to the seventh printing of the third edition.

[34] For some literature: A. Shamosh, *Ha-Keter – The Story of the Aleppo Codex* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 1987), which includes, inter alia, a thorough discussion of the question of whether its vocalization, accentuation, and Masorah were inserted by Aaron Ben Asher himself (with much literature). M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "*ktr 'rm ṣwbh whlkwt spr twrh l-RMB"M*," *Spr hywbl l-r' y"d Soloveichik* (Heb.; Jerusalem/New York, 1984) II.871–88; M. Glatzer, "The Aleppo Codex – Codicological and Paleographical Aspects," *Sefunot* 4 (1989) 167–276 (Heb. with Eng. summ.); J. Offer, "M. D. Cassuto's Notes on the Aleppo Codex," ibid., 277–344 (Heb. with Eng. summ.); Cohen, *Miqra'ot Gedolot "HaKeter"* (see n. 24).

[35] Facsimile edition by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Aleppo Codex* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1976).

[36] Goshen-Gottstein, *Isaiah;* C. Rabin, S. Talmon, E. Tov, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997); M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and S. Talmon, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Ezekiel* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004).

[37] Penkower, *New Evidence* (see n. 22 above).

of Breuer (1977–1982)[38] on the basis of Yemenite manuscripts. The *Jerusalem Crown* (2000) follows the Breuer edition.[39]

d. Representation of a Single Manuscript

The search for the best Ben-Asher manuscript involved the use of a single manuscript rather than a combination of sources. This development coincided with one of the leading ideas in *Editionstechnik* of producing a diplomatic edition on the basis of a single manuscript, not "improved" upon by readings from other sources. Soon enough, the use of a single manuscript became a leading principle in Hebrew Scripture editions, as in the case of some of the editions of the LXX,[40] Peshitta[41] and the Targumim.[42]

e. Addition of an Apparatus of Variants to the Text of Critical Editions

The search for an exact representation of a single source (in this case: a Ben-Asher *codex unicus*) often went together with the presentation of a critical apparatus (*BH* series, *HUB*) containing inner-Masoretic and extra-Masoretic variant readings. However, the two procedures are not necessarily connected, as codex L in Dotan's editions (Adi [1976] and Dotan [2001]) is not accompanied by a textual apparatus. These critical apparatuses became the centrepiece of the critical editions.

A critical apparatus provides a choice of variant readings which, together with the main text, should enable the reader to make maximum use of the textual data. Naturally, the critical apparatus provides only a selection of readings, and if this selection was performed judiciously, the apparatus becomes an efficient tool.

---

[38] In most books, this edition followed codex A, but where this manuscript has been lost, in the Torah among other places, Breuer resorted to reconstruction. In these sections, the edition is based on the majority readings among a limited number of Palestinian manuscripts, which, Breuer claims, are almost completely identical to codex A. See Breuer's introduction and Goshen-Gottstein, "Editions," 240–41 (see n. 18 above).

[39] This edition is described in the title page as "following the methods of Rabbi Mordechai Breuer." See previous note.

[40] The edition of H. B. Swete (4th edition: Cambridge: University Press, 1907–1912) and the volumes of the "Cambridge Septuagint" (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906–1940) present codex Vaticanus (B).

[41] The first volumes of *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshiṭta Version* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966–1998) present codex Ambrosianus diplomatically with a critical apparatus of variants. The volumes appearing since 1976 emend the text of this codex if it is not supported by two other manuscripts from the period preceding 1000.

[42] A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts,* vols. I–IVa (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959–1968).

f. "Eclectic" Editions

In the course of critical investigation of the Hebrew Bible, it is often felt that the combination of a diplomatically presented base text (codex L or A) and a critical apparatus do not suffice for the efficient use of the textual data. Consultation of MT alone is not satisfactory since it is merely one of many biblical texts. By the same token, the use of an apparatus is cumbersome as it involves a complicated mental exercise. The apparatus necessitates that the user place the variants in imaginary (virtual) boxes which *may* be used to replace readings of MT. In practical terms, if the scholar were to implement the recommendations of the apparatus regarding these little boxes, he/she would create a new biblical text that is actually *a* or *the* reconstructed original text. Since each scholar evaluates the data differently, everyone creates in his/her mind a different reconstructed *Urtext*. In other words, the user of the *BH* series constantly works with two sets of data, a real edition (MT) which one sees in front of him and a virtual one, which is composed eclectically from the apparatus.[43]

Against this background, it is not surprising that a system has been devised to transform the fragmented and often confusing information of a critical apparatus into a new type of edition, the "eclectic edition." It is no longer necessary to replace in one's mind a detail of MT with a variant reading found in the apparatus, as these preferred readings have actually been incorporated into the running text.[44] An edition of this type provides a very convenient way of using the textual data together with an expert's evaluation. This procedure is common in classical studies (see the many editions of Greek and Latin classical texts published by Oxford University Press and Teubner of Leipzig),[45] and also has much to recommend it for the study of Hebrew Scripture. As a result, several eclectic editions of biblical books or parts thereof have been published since around 1900.[46] In modern times,[47] this idea has been revived in the so-called *Oxford Hebrew Bible*

---

[43] The user of the *HUB* does not create his/her own virtual edition, since that edition does not provide guidance, as does the *BH* series. This edition does not provide value judgments, leaving the decision process to the user. This neutral presentation probably is profitable for those who prefer to evaluate the readings themselves during the course of writing commentaries or studies, but most users would prefer to have the data provided together with a learned value judgment.

[44] For an example, see chapter 16*, § 5.

[45] See the instructive study of M. L. West, "The Textual Criticism and Editing of Homer," in *Editing Texts – Texte edieren* (Aporemata, Kritische Studien zur Philologie-geschichte 2; ed. G. M. Most; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998) 94–110.

[46] For a list, see *TCHB,* 372, n. 1.

[47] The following editions have been published since 1990: P. G. Borbone, *Il libro del profeta Osea, Edizione critica del testo ebraico* (Quaderni di Henoch 2; Torino: Zamorani, [1990]); G. Garbini, *Il Cantico dei Cantici: Testo, traduzione e commento* (Brescia: Paideia, 1992); A. Catastini, *Storia di Giuseppe (Genesi 37–50)* (Venice: Marsilio, 1994); Hendel, *Genesis*; K. Hognesius, *The Text of 2 Chronicles 1–16, A Critical Edition with Textual Commentary* (ConBOT 51; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003); cf. my review of the latter in *SEÅ* 68 (2003) 208–13.

(*OHB*) among other publications, and is described in R. Hendel's programmatic introduction to that edition.[48] So far, only individual chapters and biblical books have been presented in this way, but the complete *OHB* will present a critical eclectic edition of the whole Bible. The procedure followed is not necessarily in disagreement with that of the *BH* series; in the words of Hendel, "[t]he *BHQ* and *OHB* are complementary rather than contradictory projects."[49]

3. Evaluation of Critical Editions

The needs of the various Bible users differ, but all of them benefit from a precise representation of Hebrew Scripture based on a single manuscript, be it L, A or any other source. Evaluations of textual readings as in the *BH* series are greatly welcomed by some scholars, but criticized by others for being intrusive and often misleading. Near-completeness as in the *HUB* is welcomed by some, but considered cumbersome by others because of the wealth of data. Finally, many scholars consider the eclectic system of the *OHB* too subjective, while others consider it helpful for the exegete. In short, there will never be a single type of edition that will please all users, partly due to the fact that these editions are used by the specialist and non-specialist alike. Being aware of these different audiences, inclinations, and expectations, we will attempt to evaluate the extant editions with an eye to their usefulness, completeness, precision, and the correctness of their data. However, it should be understood that any evaluation is hampered by the fact that the *BH* series is constantly being revised, that only the Major Prophets have been published in the *HUB*, and that none of the volumes of the *OHB* has been published yet. The use of these editions by scholars is uneven since most use the *BH* series, while the *HUB* is probably consulted mainly by specialists in textual criticism, authors of commentaries, and specialists in the intricacies of the Masorah. Our evaluation of the *BH* series will bypass *BH*, focusing on both *BHS* and *BHQ*, of which two fascicles have appeared.[50]

α. HUB

We start with the *HUB*, since most scholars are probably in agreement regarding its advantages and disadvantages, as reviewed fairly by Sanders.[51] This edition is

[48] "The Oxford Hebrew Bible: Prologue to a New Critical Edition." Prof. Hendel kindly allowed me to read a preview of that introduction. See also by the same scholar "A New Edition of the Hebrew Bible," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. One, Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006) 149–65.

[49] Hendel, "Prologue," 7 (see n. 48).

[50] 2004, 2006.

[51] J. A. Sanders, "*The Hebrew University Bible* and *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*," *JBL* 118 (1999) 518–26.

not meant for the average Bible scholar, but for the specialist.[52] The *HUB* does not present an evaluation of the evidence, considered an advantage by some and a disadvantage by others. Most relevant textual evidence is covered in great detail (note the extensive coverage of the Qumran scrolls described in chapter 16*, § 3–4). In addition, the focus of this edition on rabbinic sources is not matched by an equal amount of attention to biblical quotations in early Christian sources and in the intertestamental and Samaritan literature. However, the third volume published, that of Ezekiel, does cover the non-biblical Qumran writings.[53] The technical explanations in the apparatus realistically reflect the complexity of the evidence (e. g., regarding the LXX), but by letting the reader sense the variety of possibilities, the edition is not easy for the readers; in fact, it may be impossible to compose a user-friendly tool in this complex area. At the same time, many of these technical considerations and explanations are located in a special apparatus of notes rather than in the main apparatuses themselves. However, the reader who is well versed in the languages quoted in the first apparatus may consult the more straightforward evidence of that apparatus also without these notes.

The exegetical and translation-technical formulaic explanations attached to translational deviations from MT in the *HUB,* an innovation by the general editor of the HUBP, M. H. Goshen-Gottstein,[54] were influential in the development of other critical editions as well.[55] In this system, in a several types of differences such as in number, person, verbal tenses, and vocalization of the Hebrew, the apparatus specifies neither the data nor its text-critical value, since in these cases such a decision is impossible according to the *HUB*.[56] Instead, the apparatus describes the versional reading in general terms as e. g., "(difference in) num(ber)."

I hope I can be sufficiently objective in reviewing the *HUB*, to which I have contributed in the past, just as R. Weis, part of the *BHQ* team, is equally objective when comparing that edition with others.[57] The *HUB* is hailed by all as a perfect tool for the specialist, albeit a little too one-sided in the direction of MT and Jewish sources, and less practical for the non-specialist who would like to be spoon-fed with evaluations.

---

[52] The edition is also used outside the academic community by Orthodox Jews, who focus on the apparatuses relating to the intricacies of MT (Masorah and medieval manuscripts) and rabbinic literature.

[53] In the earlier editions of Isaiah and Jeremiah this literature was not covered.

[54] Presented for the first time in M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *The Book of Isaiah, Sample Edition with Introduction* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965).

[55] The system was accepted, with changes, in the *BH* series and the *OHB*.

[56] For a description of the system, see *TCU,* 154–62.

[57] R. D. Weis, "*Biblia Hebraica Quinta* and the Making of Critical Editions of the Hebrew Bible," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 7 (2002) [http://purl.org/TC].

β. BHS

BHS improved much on *BH* in method,[58] but several aspects remained problematic:

1. Every collection of variants presents a choice, but *BHS* often presents less data than *BH*, filling up the apparatus with less significant medieval variants from the Kennicott edition (1776–1780) and the Cairo Genizah.

2. In spite of much criticism voiced against the earlier *BH*, the number of medieval Hebrew manuscripts attesting to a certain variant is still taken into consideration in *BHS* in such notations as "pc Mss," "nonn Mss," "mlt Mss" (see, e. g. 1 Samuel 8–9).

3. Inconsistency in approach among the various books is visible almost everywhere. A glaring instance is the lack of evaluations in Samuel against the policy of *BHS* elsewhere.

4. Versional data is often presented as if unconnected to suggestions by *BHS*, and therefore creates the impression of emendations for those who are not conversant with the ancient languages.[59] This system resulted from the overly cautious approach by the editors of *BHS*, who preferred not to make a direct link between the text of a version and a Hebrew reading actually reconstructed from that version.

5. As in the *HUB*, the *BH* series focuses on the Ben-Asher text and its Masorah. It would have been better had some or equal attention been paid to the Masorah of the Samaritans and the biblical quotations in the New Testament and in Second Temple literature.

The system of *BHQ* substantially improves *BHS*, as shown in the first published fascicle that includes a very instructive "General Introduction" by the Editorial Committee:

a. The texts from the Judean Desert are covered in full by *BHQ* (see, e. g., the full coverage of the Canticles scrolls from Qumran). See below, § *e*.

b. *Formulaic explanations.* The apparatus contains a long series of formulaic explanations of the background of the versional deviations from MT in the versions which are explained as exegetical rather than pointing to Hebrew variants. Thus ואמרת לה ("and she said to him") in S in Ruth 3:14 for ויאמר ("and he said")

---

[58] See my evaluation of these two editions: "*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*," *Shnaton* 4 (1980) 172–80 (Heb. with Eng. summ.). The differences between the systems of the two editions are described in *TCHB*, 375–6.

[59] E. g. Jer 23:33 את מה משא
BH: l c GLV אתם המ׳
BHS: l אתם המ׳ cf. GV
Whether or not one should prefer the reading of GV remains to be discussed, but once one decides that a reading other than MT should be read, the reader should know that it is actually based on those versions, and that these versions should not be consulted as merely comparative material.

in MT is explained in the apparatus as "assim-ctext" (assimilation to words in the context). Naomi told her two daughters-in-law (1:8) that they should each return to the house of their *mother* (אמה), while in some manuscripts of the LXX they are told to return to the house of their *father* (τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς). This detail is explained in the apparatus as "assim-cultur" ("assimilation to the cultural pattern prevailing at the time of the translator or copyist"). Amplifications found frequently in the LXX and Targum of Esther (e. g., 1:4) are described in the edition as "ampl(ification)" or "paraphr(ase)." The apparatus to Esth 1:1 describes the LXX equivalent of Ahasverus, "Artaxerxes," as "substit." The Targum Rishon (T^R) מתגיירין of מתיהדים in Esth 8:17 is described as "lib-seman" ("liberty in respect to semantic matters") and therefore has no textual value.

These notes provide the reader with helpful explanations of the versions, and show the editors' intuition; at the same time they may be criticized as not belonging to a critical apparatus of a *textual* edition. In my view, this type of recording should be left for borderline cases in which it is unclear whether the translational deviation reflects the translator's exegesis or a Hebrew/Aramaic variant, and should not be employed when the editors themselves suggest that the translation reflects content exegesis. In the case of Esther, the free character of the LXX and Targum is well established, and therefore these exegetical notes probably should have been far fewer in number. However, *BHQ* decided to break new ground with this novel type of recording. The "General Introduction," XIII, is well aware that the novelty of this type of recording transcends the textual treatment of the Hebrew Bible in the past, but the editors nevertheless decided to include notes illustrating the translators' exegesis.

The principles behind this system have been adopted from the *HUB* (thus Weis, "*BHQ,*" § 16) and they improve the information provided but they make the edition less user-friendly than the *HUB*. Besides, *BHQ* contains many instances of exegetical renderings in the versions, while the *HUB* only contains borderline cases between exegesis and the reflection of possible variants in the translation.[60] The notation of *BHQ* is more complicated than that of the *HUB*, since in the latter edition the explanations are included in a separate apparatus of notes, while in *BHQ* the evidence is adduced *together* with its explanation in a single apparatus.

c. *Textual and literary criticism. BHQ* heralds a major change in approach towards textual data that, according to the editors, should be evaluated with literary rather than textual tools since they involve data that may reflect literary editions of a biblical book different from MT. *BHQ* now absolves such details

[60] This approach is spelled out as follows in the "General Introduction": "The editors intend that, so far as possible, the apparatus will include all cases of variation in these witnesses that meet two general criteria for inclusion. First, such a variation is judged to be text-critically significant. … Second, it is judged to be potentially significant for translation or exegesis" (p. XIII).

from textual judgment.[61] In the books published so far, this approach cannot be judged well as these problems do not feature much in the *Megillot*. But Weis, "*BHQ*," gives some examples regarding Jeremiah. Thus, the omission of נאם יהוה in the LXX of 23:1 and אלהי ישראל in 23:2 and the transposition in the LXX of vv 7–8 after v 40 are not evaluated in the apparatus since they are considered part of an overall feature of the LXX in that book, described as "lit(erary)."[62] However, once this explanation is applied to some details reflecting such a literary layer, it is hard to ascertain whether this system may be applied to all details in that layer. For example, if several details of a layer of minuses or pluses of the LXX are earmarked as reflecting a recension different from MT, should not all or most of the evidence for such a recension[63] be described in the same way,[64] with the exception of variants created in the course of scribal transmission?

The application of the principle of "lit," although heralding a novel and positive approach, is admittedly subjective and by definition can never be applied consistently. For some features in the LXX of a book may be considered by its *BHQ* editor to be literary differences, while similar features in another book are not considered literary by the *BHQ* editor of that book. This issue can be examined in the published fascicle of *BHQ* that includes the book of Esther. For in this book the LXX and LXX$^{AT\ 65}$ texts are considered by several scholars to reflect a different, even superior, Hebrew text.[66] In the *BHQ* fascicle, however, the

[61] In the words of the "General Introduction," XII: "The Hebrew Old Testament Text Project committee elaborated and implemented a particular approach to the task of textual criticism which clearly distinguishes between specific text critical matters and the history of the literary development of the text, and thus differentiates between cases proper to other scholarly methods that operate purely on the basis of internal evidence. This approach was adopted by the United Bible Societies as the basis for this new edition of *Biblia Hebraica.*" In the words of Weis, "*BHQ*," § 32: "As noted above, *BHQ* also takes seriously the survival of diverse literary forms of the text into the transmissional history of some books of the Hebrew Bible, for example, Jeremiah. This appears in the characterization of variant readings stemming from such diverse forms as "literary" (abbreviated as "lit" in the apparatus), and thus not relevant to establishing the text at hand. The editors' philosophical commitment to keeping that distinction clear is expressed in this particular fashion, however, because it is the only practical option within the limits of a one-volume edition (as opposed to printing two different texts of Jeremiah, for example)." This approach was also advocated in my *TCHB,* 348–50.

[62] This term is explained as follows: "This term indicates that a reading represents a discrete literary tradition (i. e., one of two or more surviving editions for a book) that should not itself be used to correct another text coming from a different literary tradition (i. e., another edition) represented in the reading of another witness. Samuel and Jeremiah, for example, each offer a number of such cases."

[63] That *BHQ* intends to limit remarks of this type to a few details in a literary edition rather than to all or most of them, is clear from the definition on p. XCII of "lit" where the following sentence is included: "Samuel and Jeremiah, for example, each offer *a number* <my italics, E. T.> of such cases."

[64] I refer to the various types of editorial changes mentioned in my study "Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 363–84.

[65] Also called the Lucianic version.

[66] See the description of these views in *TCU,* 255 and chapter 20* below.

major deviations of these two Greek texts, if adduced at all, are never described as "lit(erary)." The only elements that are described as "lit" in the apparatus are details from the so-called Additions to Esther, also described as the noncanonical parts of the LXX (see, e.g., the notes in *BHQ* to Esth 1:1, 3:13, 4:17). However, these Additions cannot be detached from the main Greek texts on the basis of their style, vocabulary, or subject matter,[67] and therefore at least some of the other major discrepancies of the LXX or LXX^{AT} could or should have been denoted as "lit." The practice of *BHQ* in Esther is not wrong, as the editor probably espoused a different view. But the editor's view is problematical in some instances in which the Greek deviations are based clearly on *Semitic* variants constituting a different literary edition of the book.[68] On the other hand, perhaps the absence of the term "lit" in the apparatus is due merely to an editorial inconsistency, as Schenker, in the general edition to the book, p. XIII, states that "[v]ersional pluses that are longer than one verse and come from what amounts to a separate edition of the book in question (e.g., Esther) will be indicated (usually with the abbreviation "+ txt"), but not given in full, by reason of limitations of space."[69]

d. *Cautious evaluation. BHQ* presents reconstructed variants from the versions more cautiously than in the past, but stops short of making a direct link between a reconstructed reading, preferred by that edition, and the text of the version (this practice is carried over from *BHS*; see above, 2). The reconstruction (mentioned first) and the versional reading are linked by the reference "see," which leaves room for much uncertainty and does not reflect the real relation between the two elements. In an example given in the introductory material to *BHQ* as "Figure 1" (p. LXXIII), in Jer 23:17 MT *lim^{e}na'aṣay dibber YHWH* ("to those who despise me <they say:> 'The Lord has said'") where the LXX reads τοῖς ἀπωθουμένοις τὸν λόγον κυρίου, reflecting *lim^{e}na'aṣê d^{e}var YHWH* ("to those who despise the word of the Lord"), the edition does *not* say "read *lim^{e}na'aṣê d^{e}var YHWH* with G" or the like. As in *BHS*, *BHQ* separates the two sets of information, suggesting that the reading which is actually reconstructed from the LXX is to be preferred to MT: "pref *lim^{e}na'aṣê d^{e}var YHWH* see G (S)." In this and many similar situations (cf. n. 59 above), *BHQ* presents the preferred reading almost as an emendation, since the reference to the LXX (phrased as "see") does not clarify that the suggested reading is actually based on the LXX. Readers who are not well versed in the ancient languages do not know the exact relation between the suggested reading and the ancient sources. More seriously, by presenting the evidence in this way, injustice is done to one of the basic procedures of textual criticism. It

[67] See "The 'Lucianic' Text," *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 535–48 and chapter 20* below.

[68] Note, for example, pluses in the AT text in 3:5, 6:4 (2), 6:5 (3), 6:13 (10), and see my analysis in "The 'Lucianic' Text," *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 538–9.

[69] Schenker continues: "Similarly, lengthy readings that are judged to stand in a literary relation to the text represented in the base text (e.g., a parallel text) will be signaled (usually with the abbreviation "differ-txt"), but not given in full."

is probably accepted by most scholars that equal attention should be paid to the MT and LXX, and that both the MT and LXX could reflect an original reading. If this is the case, preferable readings from the LXX ought to be presented in the same way as preferable readings from MT, even if the difficulties inherent with the reconstruction complicate their presentation and evaluation.

e. *The manuscripts from the Judean Desert* are fully recorded in *BHQ*,[70] including both significant readings – possibly preferable to the readings of MT and/or the LXX – and secondary variants. The latter type of readings do not contribute towards the reconstruction of the original text of Hebrew Scripture, but merely illustrate the process of textual transmission.[71] At the same time, differences in sense division in these scrolls receive no attention (not mentioned in the "General Introduction," XIV),[72] while the same data from the Masoretic manuscripts are recorded in great detail.[73] On the whole, due to the extensive coverage of the scrolls in *BHQ*, this edition can be used profitably as a source of information for the scrolls. On the other hand, the reader is overwhelmed with the large amount of information on secondary readings in the scrolls. Since *BHQ* provides value judgements on these readings, that edition could have differentiated between a group of valuable readings and clearly secondary readings. From reading the apparatus of Part 18, one gets the impression that the greater part of the readings belong to this second group.

The material from the Judean Desert is rightly recorded more fully than the medieval Hebrew evidence (below, § f). At the same time, the apparatus will include all the material for the SP except for orthographic and linguistic variants, all the Cairo Genizah material prior to 1000, and select Tiberian manuscripts (see below).

f. *Medieval manuscripts.* Following the study of Goshen-Gottstein,[74] *BHQ* does not record the content of the individual manuscripts from the collections of medieval manuscripts by Kennicott and de Rossi.[75] On the other hand, eight early Masoretic manuscripts listed in the "General Introduction," XX–XXV are covered. The reduction in the number of medieval manuscripts covered is a distinct improvement.

g. *Textual commentary.* For a discussion, see chapter 13*, § 3.

h. *Conservative approach to evaluations*. Textual evaluations in *BHQ* are very conservative when compared with earlier editions in the *BH* series.[76]

---

[70] For details not recorded, see chapter 16*, § 6.

[71] For examples, see chapter 16*, § 6.

[72] See chapter 16*, n. 31.

[73] See chapter 16*, n. 32.

[74] M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition," *Bib* 48 (1967) 243–90.

[75] Thus "General Introduction," XIV.

[76] For an analysis, see chapter 13, § 1j.

j. *Retroversions.* The apparatus contains a rather full presentation of the textual evidence that is at variance with the main text, MT as represented by codex L. However, the presentation of this evidence in *BHQ* differs from that in all other critical editions[77] in that the versional evidence is presented mainly in the languages of the translations, Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin. All other editions retrovert many versional readings into Hebrew, while some of them are described as readings preferable to MT (such preferences are not expressed for readings in the *HUB*). However, in the past many such retroversions in the *BH* series were haphazard, imprecise, or unfounded. Probably for this reason, *BHQ* is sparing with retroversions, presenting only one type, as stated in the "General Introduction," XIII: "[r]etroversion will be used only for a reading proposed as *preferable* [my italics, E. T.] to that found in the base text." While these retroversions are thus reduced to a minimum, other types of retroversions are nevertheless found in the apparatus, although for the editors of *BHQ* they are not considered "retroversions":

i. Versional readings that present a shorter text than MT are presented as "<" or "abbrev." This is a form of retroversion, although in the case of an ancient translation the editor wisely does not tell us whether the shortening took place in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translation or in the translator's mind.

ii. Etymological renderings based on a certain Hebrew form ("via …") which is reconstructed in the edition, but not named "reconstruction" in the *BHQ* system. For example, the rendering of כתימרות in Aquila and La^{Ep} in Cant 3:6 as ὡς ὡμοίωσις is explained in the apparatus as "via כתמונת." Further, ἀπόστρεψον of the LXX in Cant 2:17 for MT סב is explained as "via √שוב." In other cases the decision between "an actual *Vorlage* (written in a manuscript) or a virtual *Vorlage* (in the mind of the translator or copyist)"[78] is very difficult: In Cant 1:10 בתרים ("with plaited wreaths"), the reading of the LXX (ὡς τρυγόνες) is presented as "via כתרים" ("like plaited wreaths"). In a similar case later in the verse, "via" is again reserved for an interchange כ/ב. While for the reader, "via" looks like any other retroversion in the apparatus, for *BHQ* it has a status different from that of a retroversion.[79]

In their wish to record no retroversions other than those of preferred readings, *BHQ* may have gone a little too far, since the nature of the undertaking

[77] That is, previous editions in the *BH* series, the *HUB*, and the *OHB*.

[78] "General Introduction," XCIV.

[79] "This term indicates the Hebrew form that is judged to have served as the stimulus for a particular extant reading. In so marking a form, no position is taken as to whether the reading was an actual *Vorlage* (written in a manuscript) or a virtual *Vorlage* (in the mind of the translator or copyist), or even whether one could properly label the form a *Vorlage*" ("General Introduction," XCIV). It seems to me that the doubts whether a reading existed on parchment or only in the translator's mind pertain not only to this category, but to many, if not most categories of reconstructed variants. Therefore this particular type of recording need not be singled out from other reconstructions. See the discussion in *TCU*, 88–9.

requires these retroversions. Thus, loyal to its principles, *BHQ* retroverts none of the many deviations of the Greek Esther from MT, not even when reflecting an obvious Semitism as in Esth 1:4 καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, before the Greek translation of the canonical verse.[80] However, *BHQ* accepts the idea of multiple textual and literary traditions in *Hebrew*, and therefore why should these traditions not be retroverted from time to time? *BHQ* records many secondary readings (above, § b), thus rendering it in line with its principles to record, in Hebrew, readings that have the potential of being primary literary parallel traditions. It seems to us that because of the omission of reconstructions of the type described above, the reader is often deprived of much valuable information.

On the whole, *BHQ* is much richer in data, more mature, judicious and cautious than its predecessors. It heralds a very important step forward in the *BH* series. This advancement implies more complex notations which almost necessarily render this edition less user-friendly for the non-expert.[81]

γ. OHB

The *OHB* presents critical reconstructions of an original text that while imperfect, as editor-in-chief Hendel realizes, still represent the best option among the various possibilities.[82] The system chosen by the *OHB* editors can easily be examined in the editions mentioned in n. 47, and is well covered by the explanations of Hendel, "Introduction." This introduction describes in detail the notes accompanying the readings in the apparatus as opposed to the "original" readings included in the text itself. It also describes at length the shortcomings of the other types of editions. However, what is lacking is a detailed description of the principles of the decision-making process relating to the very choice of these original readings.[83] Hendel's own critical edition of Genesis 1–11 includes a discussion

[80] We take issue with the principle, not with the subjective approach which is a necessary part of the enterprise. We also accept the view that the evidence of translations that are completely exegetical is excluded from the analysis: "… when the Targum for a book, taken as a whole, is made unreliable as a witness to the Hebrew text due to extensive paraphrasis or haggadic expansion (e. g., the Targum to Canticles), it will not be cited constantly as a witness since to do so would overload the apparatus with matter that is not useful for the textual cases presented there" (p. XIV).

[81] See chapter 13*, end of § 2.

[82] In Hendel's words, "The dream of a perfect text is unreal, counterfactual. The best we can do is to make a good critical text, one that takes account of the evidence we have and the acumen we can muster" ("Introduction," 16).

[83] Hendel merely offers an abstract description of the procedure: "As a *practical* <my italics, E. T.> matter, the textual decisions that constitute the critical texts of the OHB are a collection of arguments for the earliest inferable readings on the basis of the available evidence and the editors' text-critical skills and experience" ("Introduction," 5). For additional studies on the *OHB*, see H. F. Van Rooy, "A New Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible," *JNSL* 30 (2004) 139–50 (Ezekiel); S. White Crawford, "Textual Criticism of the Book of Deuteronomy and the *Oxford Hebrew Bible Project*," in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients. Essays Offered to Honor*

of "types of text-critical decisions" (pp. 6–10) as well as valuable discussions of the relations between the textual witnesses, contributing significantly to our understanding of this issue. However, these analyses do not elucidate why the author earmarked specific details as "original" in certain constellations. It would be useful to know whether any internal or external rules exist for composing the reconstructed original text, or whether everything is left to intuition. This also remains an open question in two similar studies: the reconstruction of the original text of 2 Chronicles 1–16 by Hognesius[84] and that of Hosea by Borbone.[85]

It seems to me that three theoretical problems make the preparation of eclectic editions a difficult or, according to some, impossible enterprise:

1. In his theoretical introduction, Hendel says: "The practical goal for the *OHB* is to approximate in its critical text the textual 'archetype,' by which I mean 'the earliest inferable textual state'" (p. 3).[86] He further cautions:

> The theory of an eclectic edition assumes that approximating the archetype is a step towards the "original text," however that original is to be conceived. In the case of the Hebrew Bible it is difficult to define what the "original text" means, since each book is the product of a complicated and often unrecoverable history of composition and redaction. The "original text" that lies somewhere behind the archetype is usually not the product of a single author, but a collective production, sometimes constructed over centuries, perhaps comparable to the construction of a medieval cathedral or the composite walls of an old city.

It is a sign of good scholarship that Hendel constantly struggles with the question of the original text, as seen also in the continued analysis, in which he discusses my views. The same difficulties are recognized by Hognesius (pp. 28–9):

> It is not the intention of the present author to claim that this edition presents *the* text of 2 Chronicles 1–16, but, rather, that it attempts to make a contribution to serious scholarly discussion on text-critical matters. If eventually, such serious discussion would lead to the publishing of critical editions of the text of the Old Testament, this would be for the benefit of all Old Testament scholars.

However, in spite of the problems encountered, the editors of the *OHB* believe that there *was* an original text (or in some cases two), since otherwise they would not have reconstructed such an entity. I should therefore counter that now more than ever it seems to me that there never was an "archetype" or "original text" of

---

Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday (ed. R. L. Troxel et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005) 315–26.

[84] Hognesius, *The Text of 2 Chronicles 1–16* (see n. 47).

[85] Borbone, *Il libro del profeta Osea* (see n. 47).

[86] For this statement, Hendel refers to E. J. Kenney, "Textual Criticism," *Encyclopaedia Brittanica* (15th ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984) 18.191. On the other hand, Fox's guiding principle of his edition of Proverbs within the same *OHB* edition aims at a different stage in the development of the book, namely "the correct hyparchetype of the Masoretic Proverbs, that is to say, the proto-Masoretic text." See M. V. Fox, "Editing Proverbs: The Challenge of the *Oxford Hebrew Bible*," *JNSL* 32 (2006) 1–22 (7).

most Scripture books. True, the composition and transmission history of some units in Scripture was simpler than that of others. As a result, in many individual Psalms, the textual evidence is probably very close to that of the poems created by the ancient poets, that is, they attest to a stage rather close to the original text. Equally important is the assumption that in these cases there existed an original text created by the poet and usually not changed by later editors. For most biblical books, however, scholars assume editorial changes over the course of many generations or even several centuries. If this assumption is correct, this development implies that there never was a single text that may be considered *the* original text for textual criticism; rather, we have to assume compositional stages, each of which was meant to be authoritative when completed. Each stage constituted an entity that may be named an "original text." That text, considered final, may have been available in a single copy at first, but was probably duplicated and distributed in later times.

These compositional stages did not always take the form of a completely new edition of a biblical book, but may have involved the change of what is now a single chapter or an even smaller unit. In the wake of earlier studies,[87] we ought to ask ourselves which stage, if any, may be presented as original or archetypal in a modern edition.

The point of departure for the *OHB* is the assumption that there was one or, in some cases, two such editions that may be reconstructed. The *BH* series, and *BHQ* in particular, struggles with the same problems (see above), but in that enterprise the difficulties are fewer, since the edition itself always presents MT. In its apparatus, the *BH* series presents elements as original or archetypal, but it can always allow itself the luxury of not commenting on all details, while the *OHB* has to make decisions in all instances.

2. If the principle of reconstructing an original edition based on evidence and emendation is accepted, it remains difficult to decide which compositional level should be reconstructed. On a practical level, what is the scope of the changes one should allow himself to insert in MT? Small changes are definitely permissible, but why should one stop at verses? An editor of the *OHB* may also decide to exclude the secondarily added hymns of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1–10) and Jonah (Jonah 2). If most scholars agree that these psalms are secondary, I see no reason why an editor of *OHB* should not exclude them. I am only using this example to illustrate the problems involved; I do not think that an *OHB* editor would actually exclude these chapters (although according to the internal logic of the *OHB* they should, I think). However, I can imagine that someone would exclude Gen 12:6 "And the Canaanites were then in the land," considered secondary by all critical scholars.

[87] See chapters 11* and 15*.

In short, innumerable difficulties present themselves in places where complex literary development took place. In fact, the evaluation of the two editions of Jeremiah (see below) seems to be a simple case in comparison with the very complex compositional and transmission stages visible elsewhere.

3. On a closely related matter, the *OHB* proposes implementing a different, more advanced, procedure for "multiple early editions" of biblical books than used in the past:[88]

> The OHB aims to produce critical texts of each ancient edition, which will be presented in parallel columns. The relationship among these editions will be discussed fully in an introductory chapter to each volume. In cases where one edition is not the textual ancestor of the other(s), a common ancestor to the extant editions will be reconstructed, to the extent possible (Hendel, "Introduction," 2).

This is an important step forward, but so many problems will be encountered in the implementation of this procedure that the above description may be considered naive. How can complete editions such as reflected in the LXX be reconstructed? We know some details about the short edition of Jeremiah such as visible in 4QJer^{b,d} and the LXX, but in my view the full edition cannot be reconstructed due to our limited knowledge and evidence.

The editors of these editions probably consider them no more than scholarly exercises representing the views of a scholar at a given time, with the understanding that the same scholar's view will be quite different by the following year. Necessarily, several different eclectic editions of the same biblical book are bound to appear. On whose edition, or whose Bible, will scholars focus their exegetical activity?

4. Some Remarks on All Existing Editions

a. *The Centrality of MT.* Despite statements to the contrary, all critical and non-critical editions of Hebrew Scripture revolve around MT, which is more central than ever in everyone's thinking.[89] Non-critical editions present MT, or more precisely TMT (see n. 21), while all critical texts present MT together with an apparatus. Furthest removed from MT is the *OHB*, but even that edition uses MT as its framework, occasionally changing the base text to what is now a variant reading in one of the versions. Even when versions disagree with MT on small details, and possibly reflect superior readings, these readings have not been altered.[90] Other critical editions (the *BH* series and the *HUB*) meticulously present the best

[88] Both *BHQ* and the *OHB* seem to develop along similar lines. For *BHQ*, see above.

[89] See my paper "Place of Masoretic Text."

[90] According to the system of Hendel, it is not considered worthwhile to include anything but "significant variants," see Hendel, *Genesis*, 115 and the reaction of Weis, "*BHQ*," § 34.

Ben-Asher manuscripts, including their Masorah and open/closed sections. This precision is absolutely necessary for the study of Tiberian Hebrew and the history of MT, but somehow the readers' focus is moved away from the very important ancient material contained in the LXX and the Qumran scrolls. Readings from these sources are mentioned – in a way, hidden – in an apparatus to the text of MT rather than appearing *next* to it. The decision to structure editions around MT is natural; after all, MT *is* the central text of Judaism, and it is much valued by scholars. Besides, the scrolls are fragmentary, and the LXX is in Greek, not in Hebrew. Notwithstanding, I see a conceptual problem in the focusing of all editions on MT. I am afraid that the editions we use, despite the fullness of data in the *HUB* and *BHQ* apparatuses, perpetuate the perception that MT is *the* Bible. The systems employed in the present editions do not educate future generations towards an egalitarian approach to all the textual sources.

In a paper published in 2002,[91] I tried to show in detail how the centrality of MT negatively influences research. Although critical scholars, as opposed to the public at large, know that MT does not constitute *the* Bible, they nevertheless often approach it in this way. They base many *critical* commentaries and introductions mainly on MT; occasional remarks on other textual witnesses merely pay lip service to the notion that other texts exist. Many critical scholars mainly practise exegesis on MT. In the mentioned study, I have given examples from Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, Eissfeldt's *Einleitung*, the commentaries of Gunkel, Dahood, Noth, Westerman, Milgrom, Levine, etc., showing that important remarks and theories by these scholars were based on MT only, although all of them are aware of the LXX and the Scrolls.

Since the focus on MT does not advance literary analysis and exegesis, one wonders whether we should be thinking about a different type of edition, viz., one in which all textual witnesses are presented on an equal footing. Details from the LXX and the scrolls are currently lost in the mazes of apparatuses, but if they were to be presented more prominently, they would receive more attention. Under the present circumstances, scholars hold any one of the mentioned editions in their hands, and misleadingly call it "the Bible." All scholars know that our editions do not contain *the* Bible, but merely one textual tradition, but we often mislead ourselves into thinking that it is *the* Bible. However, the text of the Bible is found in a wide group of sources, from MT, through the Dead Sea Scrolls, to the LXX and the Peshitta. Accordingly, the *Biblia Hebraica* is, strictly speaking, a *Biblia Masoretica*. So far there is no *Biblia Hebraica* in existence, unless one considers the details in the apparatus of the *BH* series to stand for the larger entities behind them.

b. *Explanations in an apparatus.* In the last half-century, critical editions have developed through constant interaction with one another, much in the direction

[91] "Place of Masoretic Text."

of the *HUB* system, which has been known since the publication of the *Sample Edition* in 1965 (see n. 54). *BHQ* and the *OHB* have been influenced by the *HUB* in including descriptions of types of readings in the apparatus itself, mainly in order to elucidate the *secondary* status of several Hebrew and versional variants. In *BHQ*, these explanations are even more extensive and diverse than those in the *HUB*, and they are juxtaposed with the evidence, while in the *HUB* most of them appear in an apparatus of notes under the text. The recording of admittedly secondary readings together with their explanations in the apparatus of *BHQ* itself is a novelty in biblical editions, and it may deter readers from using a critical edition rather than attract them to one. It should probably be noticed that in the extensive literature on the nature of editions and apparatuses, I have not found parallels for the listing of such notes in the critical apparatus *itself*.[92] In my view, these notes disturb the flow in an apparatus that serves as an objective source of information; rather, they should be relegated to a separate apparatus of notes, as in the *HUB*. I am afraid that with the attempt to explain these variants, the main purpose of the apparatus is lost, that of providing information about non-Masoretic traditions to *be used in biblical exegesis*. This leads to the next point:

c. *A Multi-column edition?* The existing editions of Hebrew Scripture present the following options:

i. MT only: all extant non-critical editions of the Hebrew Bible.

ii. MT + variants (and emendations) in an *apparatus*: the *BH* series and the *HUB*.

iii. MT + variants and emendations in the *text*: eclectic editions.

I wonder whether a different type of edition will ever be devised, in which all the evidence will be presented in an egalitarian way in parallel columns:

iv. A multi-column edition.

The purpose of a multi-column edition would be to educate the users toward an egalitarian approach to the textual witnesses which cannot be achieved with the present tools. Such an edition would present MT, LXX, the SP, and some Qumran texts, on an *equal* basis in parallel columns, with notes on the reconstructed parent text of the LXX, and perhaps with English translations of all the data. The presentation of the text in the parallel columns would graphically show the relation between the plus and minus elements.[93] Only by this means can future generations of scholars be expected to approach the textual data in an

[92] See the papers in *Editing Texts* mentioned in n. 45 and further: D.C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship – An Introduction* (New York/London: Garland Publishing, 1994), esp. 384–417 ("Editing the Text: Scholarly Editing"); M. Mathijsen, *Naar de letter – Handboek editiewetenschap* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1995); *Scholarly Editing – A Guide to Research* (ed. D.C. Greetham; New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1995).

[93] The edition described here would not be a merely formal presentation in parallel columns of blocks of (photographically reproduced) texts, as for example in the following edition of Ben Sira: F. Vattioni, *Ecclesiastico – Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca, latina e siriaca* (Publicazioni del Seminario di Semitistica; Napoli: Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1968).

unbiased way, without MT forming the basis of their thinking. This equality is needed for literary analysis and exegesis. It would also help textual specialists.

The earliest example of such a multi-column edition, Origen's Hexapla, served a similar purpose when enabling a good comparison of the Jewish and Christian Bible. In modern times, scholars have prepared similar editions in areas other than the Hebrew Bible, when the complexity of the original shape of the composition makes other alternatives less viable.[94]

However, a close parallel is available also in the area of Hebrew Scripture: The *Biblia Qumranica* records the complete texts found in the Judean Desert together with parallel columns containing other textual witnesses. The reader learns more quickly and easily than in all other editions about the differences between the texts from the Judean Desert and the other texts, including in matters of orthography. However, this specific edition provides only a fragmentary picture of the biblical text, as its coverage does not go beyond that of the contents of the scrolls and their counterparts in other witnesses.

It may well be that there are too many practicable problems in preparing such an edition of the Hebrew Bible. The purpose of this paper is not to promote the idea of a multi-column edition, but to review all existing options.

Some Editions of Hebrew Scripture Arranged Chronologically[95]

Letteris

M. H. Letteris, תורה נביאים וכתובים (London, 1852)

BH

Ginsburg

C. D. Ginsburg, תורה נביאים כתובים, מדויק היטב על פי המסרה ועל פי דפוסים ראשונים עם חלופים והגהות מן כתבי יד עתיקים ותרגומים ישנים (London: Society for Distributing Hebrew Scriptures, 1926; repr. Jerusalem, 1970)

Cassuto

M. D. Cassuto, תנ"ך ירושלים (Jerusalem, 1958)

Snaith

---

[94] P. Schäfer and J. Becker, *Synopse zum Talmud Yerushalmi* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [P. Siebeck], 1991); idem and others, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 2; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [P. Siebeck], 1981).

[95] The first publication of each edition is followed by additional printings incorporating changes and corrections of misprints.

N. H. Snaith, ספר תורה נביאים וכתובים מדויק היטיב על פי המסורה (London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1958)

Koren
M. Koren, תורה נביאים כתובים (Jerusalem: Koren, 1962)

BHS

Adi
A. Dotan, תורה נביאים וכתובים מדויקים היטב על פי הניקוד הטעמים והמסורה של אהרן בן משה בן אשר בכתב יד לנינגרד (Tel Aviv: Adi, 1976)

Breuer
M. Breuer, תורה נביאים כתובים, מוגהים על פי הנוסח והמסורה של כתר ארם צובה וכתבי יד הקרובים לו, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 1977–1982; 1 vol.: 1989; Jerusalem: Horev, 1993)

Hebrew University Bible (HUB)
Goshen-Gottstein, *Isaiah*
C. Rabin, S. Talmon, E. Tov, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997)
M. H. Goshen-Gottstein and S. Talmon, *The Hebrew University Bible, The Book of Ezekiel* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2004)

Jerusalem Crown
Pentateuch, Prophets and Writings According to the Text and Masorah of the Aleppo Codex and Related Manuscripts, Following the Methods of Rabbi Mordechai Breuer (ed. Y. Ofer; Basle/Jerusalem: Karger Family/Ben Zvi, 2000)

Dotan 2001
A. Dotan, *Biblia Hebraica Leningradiensia* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001)

BHQ

Chapter Nineteen

Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy

The textual development of the Torah did not differ from that of the other Scripture books. It would have been understandable had early scribes been more reverential to the text of the Torah, but to the best of our knowledge this was not the case. Thus, the same variety of orthography styles that were in vogue for the books of the Prophets and Hagiographa are evidenced in the Torah. As a result, the exceedingly *plene* and very inconsistent spelling practice possibly produced by the "Qumran scribal school"[1] was also employed in several Torah scrolls.[2] Likewise, the range of variation between the textual sources in the Torah does not seem to be any narrower than in the other Scripture books; thus in Exodus 35–40 the amount of variation between the MT and LXX is much larger than in most other books, on a par with that between the MT and LXX in 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel (including their expansions known as the apocryphal Additions in the latter two books). By the same token, SP reflects an editorial stage in the composition of the Torah that differs much from that of MT and was created at a later stage. Against this background, we will take a closer look at one group of relatively small *textual* differences between the various sources, namely the harmonizing additions in the manuscripts of the Torah, especially in Deuteronomy.

A harmonization consists of the change, addition or omission of a detail in a manuscript in accordance with another verse in the same source or with another manuscript of the same composition.[3] This scribal technique was used more for additions than for omissions or changes, and it may even be questioned whether scribes deleted details because they did not occur in the parallel text.[4] The idea behind harmonizing alterations (additions and changes) is the sometimes-unconscious inclination of scribes to create greater internal consistency in the text. These harmonizations usually reflect a formal approach to Scripture according

[1] See *Scribal Practices*, 261–73.

[2] 2QExod$^{a(?),\,b(?),\,b}$, 11QLev^{b}, 4QDeut$^{j,\,k1,\,k2,\,m}$.

[3] For an analysis, see my study "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical MSS," *JSOT* 31 (1985) 3–29.

[4] In the case of the SP, to be discussed below, harmonizations almost always consist of additions, while a number of small changes in details are also evidenced. The existence of harmonizing omissions in the SP is questionable, even though such a category has been included in the thorough study of Kyung-Rae Kim, *Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994.

to which there should be complete consistency between items in the text. Harmonizing pertains to words, phrases, or complete sentences or paragraphs. For example, the formulaic expression "the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow" gives occasion to several harmonizing additions: While this expression almost always occurs as a cluster of three nouns (e. g., Deut 14:29), some occurrences of two members of this triad were almost always expanded (thus in Deut 10:18 LXX, for which see below, § 2). By the same token, any combination of two or three from among the words מצוה, משפט, חק, משמרת that are often juxtaposed may attract a third or fourth word in the manuscript tradition (see Deut 11:1; 28:15 in § 1 and 30:10 in § 2). These scribal features pertaining to small changes are distinct from the content adaptation at a larger scale in the SP, described in n. 8.

The textual patterns of development of all biblical books were different, even within the Torah. Harmonizing alterations, including additions, are found in all Scripture books, but especially in texts that lend themselves readily to such developments, that is texts with a high degree of recurring formulae, such as the formulaic descriptions of the first creation story, the laws of Leviticus, and the deuteronomistic terminology in such books as Joshua–Kings and Jeremiah,[5] and much less so the remote parallel texts Samuel–Kings//Chronicles.

The manuscripts of the Torah contain many harmonizing additions and changes in small details, more than the other books, but there are no comparative statistics regarding the level of harmonization in the various Scripture books.[6] Due to the tradents' interest in the Torah, more details in that text were harmonized, rather paradoxically, than in other texts. The present study focuses on such harmonizations in the book of Deuteronomy,[7] which leads us immediately to the SP. This ancient text, together with its "pre-Samaritan" precursors found at Qumran (the "SP group"), has been characterized as being especially prone to harmonization,[8] more so than any other known text. However, the present paper suggests that the LXX is actually much more prone to harmonization than SP if the larger content adaptations such as described in chapter 6* are excluded from this analysis. For details, see the *Conclusions* below.

In the analysis of harmonizations, we disregard a major characteristic feature of the SP group also commonly described as harmonization, namely additions of complete sentences and sections on the basis of parallel verses. Strictly speaking, these are not harmonizations at the textual level; rather, they exhibit one of the characteristic forms of content editing of the SP group (see chapter 6*).

[5] See chapter 26*.

[6] See my study "The Scribal and Textual Transmission of the Torah Analyzed in Light of Its Sanctity," forthcoming.

[7] See the insightful commentary of J. H. Tigay, *The JPS Commentary, Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), esp. 427–9 ("The Harmonistic and Critical Approaches"). See further by the same author, *Empirical Models*, 53–95 ("Conflation as a Redactional Technique").

[8] See in detail, chapter 6* and *TCHB*, 88–9.

The purpose of the present analysis is to record the harmonizing pluses in the *prose chapters* of Deuteronomy in the main textual sources (MT, LXX, SP) together with the assumed source of these harmonizations. The harmonizations are subdivided into four groups in each of which the harmonizing addition is presented in opposition to the short text in other manuscripts:

1. Harmonizing additions in the combined text of MT SP to the short text of the LXX (44)

2. Harmonizing additions in the LXX to the combined short text of MT SP (99)

3. Harmonizing additions in SP to the short text of the LXX and/or MT (49)

4. Harmonizing additions in MT to the short text of the SP and LXX (10).

The single largest group of harmonizing pluses is found in the exclusive harmonizations of the LXX. When the total numbers of harmonizations are combined for each textual source, SP contains a substantial number as well, but most of them are shared with the other sources. The data for the Qumran scrolls are included in the analysis, but because of their fragmentary status, no comprehensive statistics are presented for them.

The following list of harmonizing pluses[9] in MT LXX SP in Deuteronomy (relevant details from the Qumran scrolls are remarked upon), which is meant to be exhaustive (but not objective!), is based on the following premises:

a. By definition, a harmonizing addition is influenced by a certain context, close or remote, mentioned here as "=" or "cf." The mentioning of such a context – always subjective – makes it likely that a detail has been added in source A on the basis of a detail in another context, while it is less likely that a detail has been omitted in source B lacking that detail.

b. The list excludes some instances of apparent harmonizing additions in the LXX or MT that cannot be evaluated adequately because of our limitations in evaluating the translation technique of the LXX. Thus, when analyzing the harmonizing addition of תוך in MT Deut 23:12 אל תוך (SP אל, cf. v 11 אל תוך), the evidence of the LXX (εἰς) cannot be brought to bear on this issue since this preposition renders both אל (passim) and אל תוך (Num 17:12; Deut 13:17; contrast 21:12; 22:2).

c. The list excludes possible harmonizing additions in either MT or LXX[10] as compared with the other texts that probably resulted from textual mistakes, for example, translational doublets.[11]

d. The list excludes a few frequently occurring formulaic additions in small details for which no exact source text can be indicated: אלהים, אלהיך, etc. added

[9] Additions that are not considered to be harmonizing are not included in the lists presented below.

[10] E. g., 9:10 ἐγέγραπτο; 13:7 ἐκ πατρός σου ἢ = בן אביך או (homoioteleuton in MT?); 17:8 καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον ἀντιλογία ἀντιλογίας = ובין ריב לריב (homoioteleuton in MT?).

[11] 22:1 καὶ ἀποδώσεις αὐτῷ; 23:18 οὐκ ἔσται τελέσφορος etc.

to יהוה (eighteen times in the constellation LXX ≠ MT SP;[12] 6 times in LXX SP ≠ MT;[13] 3 times in MT ≠ LXX SP;[14] and 3 times in MT SP ≠ LXX;[15] altogether MT 6, LXX 24, SP 9), כל, נא, כן, גם, כה, pronominal prepositions such as בך, לך, the word בני in the phrase בני ישראל et sim. These instances are not harmonizing additions in the strict sense of the word, and should rather be considered adaptations to formulaic expressions.

e. The list excludes possible cases of harmonization for which no source text could be found.[16]

1. Harmonizing Additions in the Combined Text of MT SP to the Short Text of the LXX (44x)

This category lists cases of (1) a harmonizing plus of MT SP,[17] and (2) a parallel in the immediate or remote context that probably served as the base for the harmonizing addition. In all these instances the plus is lacking in the LXX. Thus, in the first instance, the harmonizing plus of MT and SP is probably based on the context in Deut 5:23. The list often refers to what we term a "reverse example," that is, a case (e. g., 4:21) in which the same element is listed in § 2 as a harmonizing plus in the LXX against the short text of MT SP. These elements are referred to as "see also Deut 9:2 in § 2."

1:15 ראשי שבטיכם = Deut 5:23
1:25 וישיבו אותם דבר = Num 13:26
1:30 לעיניכם (… עשה) = Deut 29:1
1:35 הדור הרע הזה, cf. Num 32:13 הדור העשה הרע
1:39 אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם = Num 14:31
2:3 לכם (פנו) = Deut 1:40
3:8 (חרמון) הר, cf. Deut 4:48
4:21 הטובה (הארץ) = Deut 3:25; 4:22; see also Deut 9:4 in § 2
4:26 מהר (אבד תאבדון) = Deut 4:26; 7:4; 28:20; for a similar addition, see Deut 9:16
4:49 ועד ים הערבה = Deut 3:17
8:2 זה ארבעים שנה = Deut 2:7
8:3 (ולא ידעון אבתיך) ידעת = Deut 28:36
9:10 מתוך האש = Deut 4:12, 15, 33, 36; 5:4, 22, 24, 26

[12] 4:3, 35, 39; 9:18, 22; 12:14, 25; 14:2; 15:2, 4; 21:9; 24:4; 28:7, 9, 11, 13; 29:3; 30:9.
[13] 6:18; 10:13; 16:2, 15; 18:12; 30:8.
[14] 9:5; 10:9; 15:20.
[15] 30:1, 3, 6.
[16] E. g., 13:16 MT SP ואת בהמתה לפי חרב.
[17] Spelling differences between MT and SP are disregarded in the recording.

9:15 הברית (לחות) = v 9
9:16 עגל (מסכה) = v 12 SP, Exod 32:4, 8
9:16 מהר (סרתם) = v 12; cf. Deut 4:26 above
10:4 ביום הקהל = Deut 9:10; 18:16; see also 4:10 in § 2
10:10 כימים הראשנים, cf. vv 1–3 הלחת הראשנים and Deut 9:18 כראשנה
11:1; 26:17; 30:16 (SP similar to MT) ומצותיו (משמרתו וחקתיו ומשפטיו) = Deut 5:31; 6:1, etc.; cf. 28:15 below and see also 30:10 in § 2
12:6 ואת מעשרותיכם = v 11
12:28 אחריך (לך ולבניך) = Deut 4:40; see also 11:9 in § 2
14:15 למינהו = vv 13, 14, 18; see also 14:17 in § 2
14:27 לא תעזבנו (והלוי אשר בשעריך), cf. Deut. 12:19
15:15 היום (… אנכי מצוך), cf. Deut. 8:1, 11; 10:13; see also Deut 4:2 in § 3a
17:11 אשר יורוך = v 10
18:5 כל הימים = Deut 5:29; 14:23; 19:9 with regard to the obedience to the law; see also 11:31 in § 2
19:2 לרשתה (ארצך אשר… נתן לך) = Deut 5:31; 15:4; see also 17:14 in § 2
23:3 גם דור עשירי לא יבא לו בקהל יהוה = v 4[18]
23:17 יבחר באחד שעריך (אשר) (SP: באחת), cf. Deut 17:2; 18:6
28:4 ופרי בהמתך = v 11 and Deut 30:9[19]
28:15 וחקיו (מצותיו) = Deut 27:10; 28:15; 4:40, 26:17 (reversed sequence)
28:51 עד השמדך = v 20
28:52b בכל ארצך = v 52a
28:63 להאביד אתכם = v 51?
29:4 מעליכם (בלו שמלתיכם) = Deut 8:4
30:2 אתה ובניך, cf. Deut 5:14; 6:2, etc.
30:18 לבא (שמה לרשתה) = Deut 7:1; 11:29; 23:21
31:15 באהל, cf. v 14
31:21 והיה כי תמצאן אתו רעות רבות וצרות, cf. v 17
31:23 בן נון (יהושע) = Deut 1:38, etc.
31:25 משה (ויצו) = v 22; for a reverse example, see 31:23 in § 2
32:45 כל הדברים האלה[20] את (לדבר) = Deut 31:1 (the original text of this verse, as reflected in 1QDeut^{b} 13 ii 4 and the LXX was corrupted in MT to וילך משה וידבר את הדברים האלה).

[18] It is seemingly simplistic to ascribe such a major legal statement to harmonization at the scribal level; harmonization at the compositional level would be possible, too.

[19] Tigay, *Deuteronomy,* 395 (see n. 7 above): "This phrase is redundant with the remainder of the verse. … could be an addition to harmonize … though the MT of the Torah usually avoids such readings."

[20] This word is lacking in SP.

2. Harmonizing Additions in the LXX to the Combined Short Text of MT SP (99x)

This category lists cases of (1) the harmonizing plus of the LXX, (2) the reconstructed Hebrew *Vorlage* of that plus, and (3) the textual base for the plus in the immediate or remote context. Thus, in the first instance, the short phrase of MT SP in 1:35 and 3:25 (הארץ הטובה) is paralleled by a slightly longer phrase in the LXX, (τὴν ἀγαθὴν) ταύτην (γῆν), in which the added word ταύτην (reconstructed as הזאת) is probably based on the similar phrase in Deut 4:22.

1:35; 3:25 (τὴν ἀγαθὴν) ταύτην (γῆν) : הזאת (הארץ הטובה) = Deut 4:22
2:5, 19 πολεμόν : מלחמה (אל תתגרו בם) = v 9; 2:24
2:5 (τοῖς) υἱοῖ (Ησαυ) : (עשו) בני(ל) = vv 4, 8, 12
2:7 καὶ τὴν φοβεράν : והנורא (את המדבר הגדל) = Deut 8:15; 1:19
2:14 ἀποθνῄσκοντες : למות (אנשי המלחמה) = v 16, cf. Josh 5:4
2:21 ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης : עד היום הזה = v 22
2:24 νῦν οὖν : (קמו סעו) ועתה = v 13
2:32 βασιλεὺς Εσεβων : מלך חשבון = v 24; see also v 31 in § 3a
2:36 ὄρους : (הגלעד) הר = Deut 3:12; see also 3:8 in § 1
3:24 καὶ τὴν δύναμίν σου … τὸν βραχίονα τὸν ὑψηλόν : (ואת ידך החזקה) ואת כחך ואת זרועך הנטויה = Deut 4:34; 5:15; 9:29; see further 9:26 below[21]
4:10 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας : ביום הקהל = Deut 9:10, 18:16; see also 10:4 in §1
4:11 φωνὴ μεγάλη : קול גדול = Deut 5:22
4:18 ἑρπετοῦ τοῦ : רמש (ה)רמש = Gen 1:26 and passim
4:22 τοῦτον : הזה (הירדן) = Deut 3:27
4:45 ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ : במדבר = Deut 1:1
4:49 ἡλίου : שמש (מזרחה) = v 41
5:15 καὶ ἁγιάζειν αὐτήν : לקדשו (השבת) = v 12, Exod 20:8
6:3 δοῦναι : (לך ארץ) לתת = Deut 11:9; 26:9 etc.; see also 1:35 in § 4
6:6 καὶ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σου : ועל נפשך (על לבבך) = Deut 4:29
6:13 καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν κολληθήσῃ : ובו תדבק = Deut 10:20; 13:5
6:21; 7:8 καὶ ἐν βραχίονι ὑψήλῳ : ובזרוע נטויה = Deut 4:34; 5:15; 7:19; 26:8
6:23 ταύτην : הזאת (הארץ)= Deut 4:22; 9:4
7:16 σκῦλα : (העמים) שלל (ואכלת את כל) = Deut 20:14
7:19 (καὶ τὰ τέρατα) τὰ μεγάλα ἐκεῖνα : הגדולים ההם (והמופתים) = Deut 29:2
8:15 ἐκείνης : ההוא (במדבר הגדל והנורא) = Deut 1:19
8:19 τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν : את השמים ואת הארץ (העדתי בכם היום) = Deut 4:26
9:2 καὶ πολύν : (ורם) ורב (עם גדל) = Deut 2:10, 21; see also 1:28 in § 1
9:4; 31:20, 21 τὴν ἀγαθήν : הטובה (הארץ) = Deut 11:17; see also 4:21 in § 1

[21] The short text of MT is also reflected in 4QDeut[d].

9:14 μέγα : (לגוי) גדל (עצום ורב) = Deut 26:5
9:26 ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι σου τῇ μεγάλῃ … καὶ ἐν τῷ βραχίονι σου ὑψήλῳ : … בכחך הגדול ובזורעך הנטויה = v 29; see 3:24 above
9:27 οἷς ὤμοσας κατὰ σεαυτοῦ : אשר נשבעת בך = Exod 32:13
9:29 ἐκ γῆς αἰγύπτου : מארץ מצרים = Deut 5:6; SP ממצרים resembles LXX
10:18 προσηλύτῳ : (יתום ואלמנה) גר = Deut 14:29 and passim
11:8 ζῆτε καὶ πολυπλασιασθῆτε : תחיון ורביתם (למען …) = Deut 8:1
11:9 μετ᾽ αὐτούς : אחריהם (להם ולזרעם) = Deut 1:8; 10:15; see also 12:28 in § 1
11:24 τοῦ μεγάλου : הגדל (הנהר)= Deut 1:7
11:28a ὅσας ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον : אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם היום = vv 27, 28b
11:31 ἐν κλήρῳ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας : לרשתה כל הימים = Deut 12:1; for a similar example, see 17:14 below
12:14 ὁ θεός σου αὐτόν : אלהיך בו = v 11 (המקום אשר יבחר יהוה אלהיכם בו)
12:14 σήμερον : היום (אשר אנכי מצוך/מצוה אתכם) = Deut 4:40; 8:1, 11; 10:13; 11:13, 27; 27:4; 28:14; see also 4:2 in § 3a
12:15 ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό : יחדיו (הטהור) = v 22
12:25; 21:9 τὸ καλὸν καί : הטוב ו(הישר בעיני יהוה אלהיך) = Deut 12:28
12:26; 17:8 ὁ θεὸς σου ἐπικληθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ : אלהיך לשכן שמו שם = vv 5, 11, 21
12:27 τὴν βάσιν: (המזבח/מזבח העולה) יסוד = Lev 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34, etc.
14:17 (καὶ ἱέρακα) καὶ τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῷ : למינה = vv 13, 15, 18; see also v 15 in § 1
14:23 οἴσετε : תביאו (שם) = Deut 12:11
15:10 καὶ δάνειον δανιεῖς αὐτῷ ὅσον ἐπιδέεται : והעבט תעביטנו די מחסרו = v 8
15:11 ποιεῖν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο : לעשות את הדבר הזה (אנכי מצוך לאמר) = Deut 24:18
15:15 ἐκεῖθεν : משם (ויפדך יהוה אלהיך) = Deut 24:18
15:22 ἔδεται : יאכלנו (כצבי) = Deut 12:15
16:8 πλὴν ὅσα ποιηθήσεται ψυχῇ : אך אשר יאכל לנפש = Exod 12:16 (לכל נפש)
17:10 ὁ θεὸς σου ἐπικληθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ : אלהיך לשכן/לשום שמו שם = Deut 12: 5, 11, 21
17:12 ὃς ἂν ᾖ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις : אשר יהיה בימים ההם = v 9
17:14; 25:15 ἐν κλήρῳ : לרשתה (אשר יהוה אלהיך נתן לך) = Deut 3:18; 5:31; 12:1; 19:14 (alternatively, the LXX reflects נחלה, cf. 4:21; 21:23; 24:4; 25:19; 26:1); for a similar example, see 11:31 above; see also 19:2 in § 1
18:19 ὁ προφήτης : הנביא (אשר ידבר) = vv 18, 22 and 4Q175 7; MT = 4QDeut^{f}
18:22 ἐκεῖνος : ההוא (הנביא) = v 20
19:7 τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο : הדבר הזה (מצוך) = Deut 15:15
20:16 τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν : את ארצם (נתן לך נחלה) = Deut 4:38, cf. 9:5
21:8 ἐκ γῆς αἰγύπτου : מארץ מצרים (אשר פדית יהוה) cf. Deut 9:26; MT = 4QDeut^{f}
21:23b ἐπὶ ξύλου : על עץ (תלוי) = v 23a
24:17 καὶ χήρας : (גר יתום ואלמנה) = Deut 14:29; 16:11 etc.; cf. v 19 below
24:19 τῷ πτωχῷ : (לגר ליתום ולאלמנה) לעני= v 14; cf. v 17

24:20 ἐπαναστρέψεις : (תפאר) תשוב = v 19 (this is a secondary element, since the idea of תשוב is already expressed by תפאר)
24:20 καὶ μνησθήσῃ ὅτι οἰκήτης ἦσθα ἐν γῇ αἰγύπτῳ διὰ τοῦτο ἐγώ σοι ἐντέλλομαι ποιεῖν τὸ ῥημα τοῦτο : וזכרת כי עבד היית בארץ מצרים על כן אנכי מצוך לעשות את הדבר הזה = v 22
26:8 αὐτος ἐν ἰσχύι μεγάλῃ : הוא בכח גדל = Deut 9:29
26:10 γῆν ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι : ארץ זבת חלב ודבש = Deut 6:3; 11:9; 26:15
26:15 δοῦναι ἡμῖν : לתת לנו (כאשר נשבעת לאבתינו) = Deut 1:8, 35; 11:9, 21; 31:7; similarly 6:3 and 31:20 above and below; see also 1:35 in § 4a
27:3 τὸν ἰορδάνην : את הירדן (בעברך) = Deut 2:29; 3:27; 4:21, etc.
27:7 καὶ ἐμπλησθήσῃ : ושבעת (ואכלת) = Deut 6:11; 8:10; 11:15
28:1 καὶ ἔσται ὡς ἂν διαβήτε τὸν ἰορδάνην εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν δίδωσιν ὑμῖν : והיה כאשר תעברו את הירדן אל הארץ אשר יהוה אלהיכם נתן לכם = Deut 27:1 with small differences
28:12 καὶ ἄρξεις σὺ ἐθνῶν πολλῶν σοῦ δὲ οὐκ ἄρξουσιν : ומשלת בגוים רבים ובך לא ימשלו = Deut 15:6
28:24, 45 ἕως ἂν ἀπολέσῃ σε : ועד אבדך = v 20
28:56 σφόδρα : מאד (והענגה) = v 54
28:60 τὴν πονηράν : הרע (מדוה מצרים) = Deut 7:15
29:19 τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης : הברית הזאת = v 20
29:26 τοῦ νόμου : התורה (הזה) (בספר) = Deut 29:20; 30:10, etc.
30:10 ποιεῖν : לעשות (לשמור) = Deut 5:1, 32; 6:3, 25; 7:12, etc.; see also 12:28 in § 3a and 28:15 in § 4b
30:10 καὶ τὰς κρίσεις αὐτοῦ : ומשפטיו (מצותיו וחקתיו) = Deut 26:17; cf. 11:1, 26:17 and 28:15 in § 1. Note a similar addition in 4QDeut^{j,k1} in Deut 11:8
30:16 ἐὰν δὲ εἰσακούσῃς τὰς ἐντολὰς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου : אם תשמע אל מצות יהוה אלהיך = Deut 11:13
30:18 ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι : אשר יהוה אלהיך נתן לך (האדמה) = Deut 5:16; 17:14; 18:9, etc.
31:4 τοῖς δυσί : שני (מלכי האמרי) = Deut 3:8; 4:47
31:4 οἳ ἦσαν πέραν τοῦ ἰορδάνου : אשר בעבר הירדן = Deut 3:8; 4:47
31:6 μηδὲ δειλία : ואל תחת (אל תיר[ו]) = Deut 1:21; 31:8
31:9 τὰ ῥήματα : את דברי (התורה הזאת) = Deut 31:24
31:9 εἰς βιβλίον : על ספר = Deut 31:24
31:10 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ : ביום ההוא (ויצו משה אתם) = Deut 27:11
31:14b εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου : אל אהל המועד (ויהושע) = v 14a
31:14b παρὰ τὰσ θύρας : על פתח (אהל מועד) = v 15
31:23 μωυσῆς : משה (ויצו) = v 22; see also v 25 in § 1
34:8 ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰορδάνου κατὰ ἰεριχω : על ירדן ירחו (בערבות מואב) = Num 26:3, 63; 31:12, etc.

3. Harmonizing Additions in SP (LXX) to the Short Text of MT (49x)

a. Pattern SP LXX ≠ MT (27x)

1:41 אלהינו (חטאנו ליהוה); cf. Exod 10:16, Deut 9:16
2:13 סעו (קמו) = v 25
2:31 מלך חשבון האמרי = Num 21:24; see also 2:32 in § 2
3:12 שפת (נחל ארנן) = Deut 2:36; 4:48
4:2 היום (אשר אנכי מצוה אתכם) = Deut 11:13, 27, 28 etc.; same constellation in 6:2; 11:22; 13:1; see also 12:28 in § 3b, 12:14 in § 2, and 15:15 in § 1
4:33 חיים (קול אלהים) = Deut 5:26
5:14 בו (לא תעשה) = Exod 31:14, 35:2
5:22 חשך (הענן והערפל) = Deut 4:11; cf. also next verse
6:20 והיה (כי ישאלך) = Exod 13:14
8:7 ורחבה (ארץ טובה), cf. Exod 3:8 (4QDeut^{f,j,n} agree with SP LXX)
9:29 ממצרים; cf. LXX (ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου); cf. vv 12, 26
10:11 הזה (העם) = Deut 9:13, 27
12:11 ונדבתיכם = Deut 12:6
12:28 ועשית (שמר ושמעת) = Deut 16:12; 26:16; similarly 30:10 in § 2
13:12 עוד (יוספו); cf. Gen 28:68
13:19 והטוב (לעשות הישר) = Deut 6:18, 12:25
14:8 ושסע שסע פרסה = Lev 11:7
16:2 אלהיך = Deut 12:18
16:12 (מצרים) בארץ = Deut 5:15, 15:15
16:16 בו (אשר בחר); cf. Num 16:5, 17:20
17:6 על פי (שלשה עדים) = Deut 19:15; cf. v 6a;
18:5 לעמד לפני יהוה לשרתו (ולשרתו) לפני יהוה אלהיך (לעמוד); cf. 10:8
20:17 והגרגשי (והיבוסי) (LXX different sequence) = Deut 7:1
24:8 התורה (ולעשות ככל) = Deut 17:11
31:18 מהם (אסתירה פני) = Deut 32:20
31:20 (ארץ) לתת להם (אבותיו) = Deut 1:8, 10:11, 11:9, etc.; see also 26:15 in § 2
31:21 לאבותיו (נשבעתי) = Deut 1:8, 35; 6:10, etc.; see also 8:18 and 34:4 in § 3b

b. Pattern SP ≠ MT LXX (22 x)

1:43 אלהיכם (ותמרו את פי יהוה) = Deut 9:23
2:5 ירשה (מארצם) = vv 9, 19
2:8 פן בחרב אצא לקראתך … ואשלחה מלאכים = Num 20:14, 17
2:12b ויירשום (וישבו) v 12a
4:49 ים המלח (ים הערבה) = Deut 3:17
8:18 לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב (אשר נשבע לאבתיך) = Deut 1:8, 6:10; cf. 34:4 below

9:12 (מסכה) עגל = v 16
10:7 משם נסעו … תחתיו; cf. Num 33:31–38
11:6 ואת כל האדם אשר לקרח = Num 16:32
11:30 מול שכם (אלון מורא); cf. Gen 12:6
12:28 היום (אשר אנכי מצוך) = Deut 11:13, 27, 28 etc.; see also 4:2 in § 3a
14:16 ואת השלך = Lev 11:17
16:8 עבודה (מלאכת) כל; cf. Exod 12:16
17:20 (ממלכתו) כסא = v 18
22:1, 4 או את כל בהמתו not in MT LXX; cf. Exod 22:9; Deut 5:14; 14:4
22:2 מעמך; cf. context and Deut 18:19; 23:22
24:1 (ובעלה) ובא אליה; cf. Deut 21:13; 22:13
25:6 (הבכור) הבן (LXX τὸ παίδιον); cf. Deut 21:15–16
27:9 (לעם) קדש = Deut 26:19
28:18 ופרי בהמתך = Deut 28:4, 11, 51; 30:9
34:4 (נשבעתי) לאבותיך (לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב); see also 31:21 in § 3a

4. Harmonizing Additions in MT (LXX) to the Short Text of the SP (10x)

a. Pattern MT ≠ SP LXX (2x)

1:35 לתת (אשר נשבעתי) = Deut 1:8, 35; 11:9, 21; see also 6:3 in § 2
23:12 תוך (אל) = v 11 (evidence of LXX unclear)

b. Pattern MT LXX ≠ SP (8x)

2:9 בם מלחמה (ואל תתגר) = vv 5, 19, Num 21:12
2:11 רפאים יחשבו אף הם כענקים = Deut 2:20, 3:11, 13
3:21 כל (אשר עשה יהוה) אלהיכם (את) = Num 27:23
9:11 לחת האבנים (לוחת הברית) = Deut 5:22, 9:15, 10:3
11:3 מלך מצרים (לפרעה) = Deut 7:8
24:22 (אנכי מצוך) לעשות = v 18
28:15 (מצותיו) לעשות את כל (לשמר) = Deut 5:1, 32; see also 30:10 in § 2 and 12:28 in § 3a
30:5 והיטבך (וירשתה); cf. Deut 6:18

Some Conclusions

a. Statistics

The comparative frequency of harmonizing additions in the ancient sources of Deuteronomy is calculated on the basis of the data provided above. The statistics exclude a few frequently occurring formulaic additions as well as uncertain cases or possible cases of harmonizing additions for which no source could be found. Because of the exclusion of these details (mentioned in the introduction above), the total number of harmonizing additions could be slightly higher.

The figures for the various types of textual relations are provided in the headings to each section. From these data, it is clear that by far the largest group of harmonizing additions is found in the LXX (99 instances recorded in § 2). A similar conclusion was reached by Hendel relating to Genesis 1–11 where the largest number of harmonizations was found in the LXX, followed by SP (with half of such instances), with MT reflecting only a few such features.[22] Previous characterizations referring to SP as the text most prone to harmonizing have to be abandoned and instead the LXX has to be dubbed as such, at least in Deuteronomy. It has to be remembered that this statistical evaluation of the *scribal* feature of harmonizing is related to our exclusion from the analysis (see n. 9 above) of the content rewriting of the SP group on the basis of parallel passages (strictly speaking, no harmonization). Had such instances been included in the analysis, the results would still be very similar in Deuteronomy, while in Exodus and Numbers the situation would be somewhat different because of the large number of added verses that rewrite the text.

The inclination toward harmonization in the Hebrew text behind the LXX is clearer if the total figures for each source are taken into consideration beyond the complicated web of internal relations such as reflected in the headers to the categories. The LXX of Deuteronomy contains a total of 134 instances of harmonization as opposed to 93 for SP and 54 for MT. However, within these figures, the LXX reflects 99 exclusive instances of harmonization (§ 2), SP a mere 22 instances (§ 3b), and MT only 2 exclusive harmonizations (§ 4a).

b. Harmonizing in the Hebrew parent text of the LXX or by the Greek translator?

In the study quoted in n. 3, we discussed the possible distinction between harmonizations by either the translator or his Hebrew parent text. We suggested that each instance and each translation need to be evaluated separately, but usually the harmonization should be attributed to the Hebrew parent text unless the

[22] Hendel, *Genesis*, 81–92.

opposite can be established. This seems to be the case also in the Greek text of Deuteronomy.[23]

c. Background of the harmonizations

The person(s) who added the harmonizing additions in the various sources was (were) very well acquainted with the context, as well as with parallel descriptions in other chapters, e. g., 29:4 בלו שמלתיכם מעליכם where the addition is based on Deut 8:4. He was also well aware of the parallels between Deuteronomy and the preceding books, as shown, for example, by the following additions:

1:25 וישיבו אתנו דבר (MT SP) = Num 13:26
1:39 אשר אמרתם לבז יהיה ובניכם (MT SP) = Num 14:31
9:27 οἷς ὤμοσας κατὰ σεαυτοῦ (LXX) : אשר נשבעת בך = Exod 32:13

d. Universal character of harmonization

Although harmonizing additions occur in Deuteronomy, especially in the LXX, they occur in all sources with different frequencies. The same word or phrase may be added as a harmonizing plus in the Hebrew parent text of the LXX or SP or MT, or in the text common to two or three of these texts. This phenomenon shows that there is no overall guiding principle behind these harmonizing additions, and that they could be inserted at any given moment guided by the changing instincts of scribes. Thus ביום הקהל was added to the base text in the tradition behind MT SP in Deut 10:4, and in the tradition behind the LXX in 4:10. Both traditions have this phrase in common in Deut 9:10; 18:16.

e. Inconsistency

Harmonizing additions reflect an aspect of scribal activity that, as with all other such activities, is inconsistent. Items that were harmonized once were not necessarily harmonized on another occasion.

---

[23] For example, at face value it seems as if the addition of the LXX in 11:31 ἐν κλήρῳ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας is influenced by the Greek translation of the nearby verse 12:1 where the same phrase renders לרשתה כל הימים. The seemingly unusual equivalent לרשתה – ἐν κλήρῳ seems to indicate influence at the translational level. However, upon further investigation, one notices that ἐν κλήρῳ renders לרשתה also in 3:18 and this equivalent is also used for ירושה without a preposition (2:5, 9, 19). Since the same translator rendered all these chapters, these and other idiosyncratic renderings are bound to occur throughout the Greek translation, and therefore this case does not prove harmonization by the translator. This seems to be the case for most instances, although inner-Greek harmonization should not be ruled out. Thus the plus in 16:8 πλὴν ὅσα ποιηθήσεται ψυχῇ possibly reflects the LXX of Exod 12:16 where the Greek translation differs from the Hebrew (אך אשר יאכל לנפש).

Chapter Twenty

Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere

The LXX is a source of information for many fields of study. For the student of Hebrew Scripture, that version is a source of ancient exegesis and a treasure-trove of Hebrew readings that differ from MT. These readings are taken into consideration in the textual and literary analysis. Our study does not deal with individual secondary readings, but with *complete* books that may reflect a stage *subsequent* to that in MT. I believe that the Greek translations of 1 Kings (named Kingdoms γγ or 3 Kingdoms), Esther, and Daniel (especially chapters 4–6) attest to such stages. To the best of my knowledge, there are no additional books or long stretches of text[1] like these within Greek Scripture.[2] Following E. J. Bickerman's monograph, *Four Strange Books of the Bible: Jonah, Daniel, Kohelet, Esther*,[3] we name these books "three strange books of the LXX," as they differ much from the remainder of Greek Scripture, and pose many challenges for researchers. The three strange books differ from books and segments in the LXX that probably *preceded* the literary development of their counterparts in MT and differed from it in major ways: 1 Samuel 16–18,[4] Jeremiah,[5] and Ezekiel.[6] These books also

[1] An exception may be 1 Esdras which as a whole (and not partially as the three mentioned books) reshaped segments of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. Many of the details of the rewriting in that book are still not understood. See Z. Talshir, *1 Esdras – From Origin and Translation* (SBLSCS 47; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999); eadem, "Synchronic Approaches with Diachronic Consequences in the Study of Parallel Editions," in *Yahwism after the Exile* (ed. R. Albertz; Studies in Theology and Religion 5; Assen: van Gorcum, 2003) 199–218 = "Synchronic Approaches with Diachronic Consequences in the Study of Parallel Redactions: New Approaches to 1 Esdras," in *Border Line*, 77–97 (Heb.).

[2] However, some scholars consider the Greek of 1 Samuel 16–18 to reflect such a secondary source. See the views quoted in n. 4 below.

[3] New York: Schocken, 1967. Two of Bickerman's "strange books," Daniel and Esther, are included among the three books analyzed here.

[4] See J. Lust and E. Tov in D. Barthélemy et al., *The Story of David and Goliath, Textual and Literary Criticism, Papers of a Joint Venture* (OBO 73; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions universitaires/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986). On the other hand, D. Barthélemy and D. W. Gooding writing in the same monograph ascribe the shortness of the LXX to the translator's revisional activities. This is also the view of A. Rofé, "The Battle of David and Goliath – Folklore, Theology, Eschatology," in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (ed. J. Neusner et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 117–51.

[5] See *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 363–84.

[6] See *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 397–410.

differ from Exodus 35–40[7] and Proverbs[8] since the *Vorlagen* of these two books differ mainly qualitatively in major ways from MT, not mainly quantitatively, as the three strange books.[9]

In the case of the three strange books, the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts are among the greatest in the LXX. We suggest that, in all three cases, the LXX preserves a translation of Semitic texts other than MT, probably in Hebrew in the case of 1 Kings and Esther and Aramaic in the case of Daniel 4–6. The suggestion that these three books are later than the stage included in MT is not offered without a residue of doubt; indeed, in all three cases it has also been argued that the differences (1) were created by the Greek translators or (2) reflect stages in the development of the Hebrew books anterior to that included in MT. Controversies of this nature cannot be settled in a brief study like this. If one of these alternative views is more convincing than the view presented here, my own analysis may well be irrelevant. If, for example, someone believes that it was the translator of 3 Kingdoms who created the greatly differing version, the view presented here with regard to that book is irrelevant. Longer studies of 1 Kings and Esther are being published elsewhere (see the notes below).

The discussion will focus on the rewriting in each of the three books (A–C), turn to parallels in the Qumran scrolls (D), and to matters of text and canon (E). Following the sequence of the books in Hebrew Scripture, we first deal with 3 Kingdoms. This is probably the most convincing case among the three books and, at the same time, the most unexpected one in Greek Scripture.

---

[7] For a brief summary of the research on this unit, see *TCU,* 256. A. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993) 116–30 (125) probably indicated the correct direction for a solution by pinpointing variant readings in the translator's *Vorlage* and by analyzing his translation technique. On the other hand, D.W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle* (TS NS VI; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959) viewed the LXX as an inner-Greek revision. The discrepancies between the LXX and MT in these chapters probably constitute the greatest challenge for LXX scholarship. The problems may not be more vexing than those in 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel, but the difficult subject matter complicates the analysis.

[8] The present author entertains the possibility of a different Hebrew editorial layer, while Fox thinks in terms of individual Hebrew readings: Tov, *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 419–31; M. Fox, "LXX-Proverbs as a Text-Critical Resource," *Textus* 22 (2005) 95–128. On the other hand, J. Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs – Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (VTSup 69; Leiden/New York/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1997) ascribes the differences to the Greek translator.

[9] In the case of Proverbs and Exodus 35–40 the relation between MT and LXX is unclear.

A. 3 Kingdoms

3 Kingdoms (1 Kings)[10] poses a greater challenge for the researcher than the other three books of the Greek Kingdoms (1–2, 4 Kingdoms). The many problems discussed over the past half-century, relating to the *kaige*-Th revision in 2 and 4 Kingdoms and the evaluation of the Hebrew text of 1–2 Samuel in the wake of the Qumran discoveries, are very complex. However, they are less complicated than the evaluation of the Greek translation of 1 Kings. From the many studies published in the past half-century, it has become clear that there is no consensus concerning the evaluation of that version.[11]

1. Background of the Discrepancies between 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms

The discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek texts resulted from changes made in either MT or the LXX, and therefore they cannot be described easily in neutral terms. The 2005 monograph by P. S. F. van Keulen, which includes an excellent summary of the previous research and of the issues themselves, describes the features of 3 Kingdoms as follows:[12] "The student of 3 Regum is not only struck by the high rate but also by the diversity of differences vis-à-vis 1 Kings that are contained in the book. Pluses and minuses are frequent, as well as word differences. Some of the pluses in 3 Regum consist of duplicate renderings of passages appearing elsewhere in the translation. One plus even involves a rival version of events already recounted in the preceding narrative (i. e., 3 Reg 12:24a–z). Furthermore, corresponding sections may appear at different positions in 3 Regum and 1 Kings, thus causing a different arrangement of narrative materials. Most of these sequence differences occur in the first half of the book. Another peculiar deviation from MT, typical of the second half of 3 Regum, pertains to the chronological data for kings following Solomon." Van Keulen focused on the first half of the book in which these features are evident, but they also occur in the second half, albeit less frequently. Thus, in the second half there are no parallels to the summaries in chapter 2 or the "alternative version" in chapter 12.

---

[10] Modern research distinguishes between:
(1) Kingdoms α (1 Samuel)
(2) Kingdoms ββ (2 Samuel 1:1–11:1)
(3) Kingdoms βγ (2 Samuel 11:2–1 Kgs 2:11)
(4) Kingdoms γγ (1 Kgs 2:12–21:15) *to be referred to below as "3 Kingdoms"*
(5) Kingdoms γδ (1 Kgs 22:1–2 Kgs 24:15).

[11] See my study "3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions," *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst et al.; JSJSup 122; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2007) 345–66.

[12] Van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 1.

2. The Discrepancies between 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms Originated in Hebrew

Since it is difficult to decide between the two opposing types of explanations regarding the nature of 3 Kingdoms, the decision as to whether the deviations were created at either the Hebrew or Greek level would limit the options.

The following types of arguments could support the suggestion that the discrepancies were created at the Greek level: (1) indication of original Greek; (2) lack of Hebraisms; (3) differences between the translations of parallel passages.[13] The following arguments could support the suggestion that the discrepancies were created at the Hebrew level: (1) presence of Hebraisms;[14] (2) reflection of Hebrew readings in the LXX differing from MT; (3) recognition of faithful translation technique.[15]

Turning to some or all of these criteria does not necessarily guarantee objective results, since every type of result may be interpreted in different ways. In my view, no compelling arguments have been presented in favor of the assumption of revision at the Greek level, neither by Gooding nor by van Keulen (see notes 12 and 24). The Greek renderings of parallel passages differ occasionally, but such inconsistency also occurs in translations produced by a single translator.[16] Besides, the various translations of these parallel sections in 3 Kings, even when differing slightly, share several unique renderings.[17] These arguments make the assumption of inner-Greek revision unlikely. On the other hand, there are compelling arguments in favor of a Hebrew source at the base of 3 Kingdoms supporting the assumption of major differences between MT and the Hebrew source of the LXX: Tov[18] records Hebraisms in the Summaries (also known as "Additions" or "Miscellanies"),[19] which are described in greater detail by Polak[20] and Schenker

[13] See, however, notes 16–17.

[14] For the background, see *TCU*, 83–5.

[15] Analysis of the level of freedom and literalness in the translators' approaches forms a key element in our understanding of them and their use as an ancient document in the study of Hebrew Scripture. In short, the argument runs as follows. If a translator represented his Hebrew text faithfully in small details, we would not expect him to insert major changes in the translation. Therefore, when we find major differences between the LXX and MT in relatively faithful translation units, they must reflect different Hebrew texts. These differing Hebrew texts are of central importance to our understanding of Hebrew Scripture. On the other hand, if a translator was not faithful to his parent text in small details, he also could have inserted major changes in the translation.

[16] See, for example, T. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translation or Recensional Activity?" *AbrN* 21 (1982–1983) 28–49 (30–31).

[17] For some examples relating to chapter 2, see Tov, *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 549–70.

[18] Ibid., 568.

[19] 35g, k, l.

[20] F. H. Polak, "The Septuagint Account of Solomon's Reign: Revision and Ancient Recension," in Taylor, *X Congress*, 139–64 (143–8).

(relating to all of 1 Kings),[21] and Tov[22] and Schenker[23] list variants reflected in the LXX. Even Gooding accepts the view that 3 Kingdoms has a Hebrew base.[24] The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the duplicate version of the Jeroboam story (1 Kgs 12:24a–z) has been reconstructed by Debus[25] and Talshir,[26] while that of the Summaries in chapter 2 has been reconstructed in my own study.[27] Wevers[28] and Talshir[29] indicate that the translator of 1 Kings rendered his parent text faithfully.

As a result, there is sufficient support for the assumption that the Greek translation of 1 Kings was based on a Hebrew source. This text could have been anterior or subsequent to MT. Since the tendencies of the Greek 3 Kingdoms are easily recognized (see below), and since no overall reverse theory has been suggested for corresponding tendencies in MT,[30] we accept Talshir's view[31] that the *Vorlage* of 3 Kingdoms reworked a text resembling MT. Polak expressed a similar view.[32] Ultimately, this view is close to Gooding's theory, except that he believes that the rewriting activity was carried out in Greek by a reviser and not in the Hebrew text consulted by the translator.

3. Characteristic Features of 3 Kingdoms

The following features not only characterize the Greek 3 Kingdoms, but are in most cases unique to it:

i. Addition in chapter 2 of two long theme *summaries*[33] (previously named Additions or Miscellanies) focusing on Solomon's wisdom. These added summaries

---

[21] Schenker, *Septante*. E. g. pp. 54 (relating to 10:23–25), 130–39 (chapters 6–8), and 149. For a thorough critique of this book, see M. Pietsch, „Von Königen und Königsbücher," *ZAW* 119 (2007) 39–58.

[22] Tov, "LXX Additions," 551–62. For additional differences between the MT and LXX, see chapter 26* below.

[23] *Septante,* 5–9.

[24] D. W. Gooding regards 3 Kingdoms as a Midrashic version of 1 Kings. See his summarizing study "Text and Midrash," 18; idem, *Relics*, 111.

[25] J. Debus, *Die Sünde Jerobeams* (FRLANT 93; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967) 55–65.

[26] Z. Talshir, *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom: 3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6; Jerusalem: Simor, 1993) 38–153.

[27] Tov, "LXX Additions."

[28] J. W. Wevers: "Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of 1 Kings ii 12–xxi 43," *OTS* 8 (1950) 300–22 (300).

[29] Talshir, "Image," 256.

[30] Schenker, *Septante,* 151 mentions some elements of supposed revision in MT, but they do not cover the large differences between the two versions.

[31] Talshir, "Image," 302.

[32] Polak, "Septuagint Account" (see n. 20).

[33] To the best of my knowledge, only J. Gray, *1 & 2 Kings–A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1964) 45 has used this term.

repeat various sections occurring elsewhere in the book (see further below).[34] To the best of my knowledge, this device is not used elsewhere in MT or the Greek Bible.[35] The closest parallel is the added summary before the LXX of Daniel 5 (see below), although that summary is not a theme summary.

ii. *Duplication* of sections based on the rewriting tendencies. Beyond the passages mentioned in section i, referring to summaries that constituted new literary compositions, the rewritten text of 3 Kingdoms repeated 1 Kgs 22:41–51 (description of Jehoshaphat's activities) in 3 Kingdoms 16:28a–h and 1 Kgs 9:24 in v 9a of the same chapter in 3 Kingdoms. To the best of my knowledge, the device of repeating sections is not used elsewhere in the Greek Bible or MT.[36]

iii. Inclusion of an *alternative version*. A lengthy alternative history of Jeroboam extant only in the LXX (3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z) presents a rival story juxtaposed with the original one found in all textual sources including the LXX (1 Kings 11, 12, 14). The technique of juxtaposing two versions of the same story was used from ancient times onwards in the composition of Hebrew Scripture. However, with one exception (1 Samuel 16–18),[37] there is no parallel for the juxtaposition of two alternative versions appearing in one textual witness but not in the others.

iv. The transposition of verses to other environments in accord with the reviser's tendencies, especially his chronological rearrangements: For example, 1 Kgs 3:1 and 9:16–17 are repositioned as 3 Kgdms 5:14a;[38] 1 Kgs 5:7–8 is repositioned as 3 Kgdms 5:1 (see paragraph 4); 1 Kgs 5:31–32 and 6:37–38 are moved to

[34] See below, § 4. The location of these summaries is inappropriate since Solomon is not yet a central person in this chapter. Possibly the location was determined by the scope of the ancient scrolls. Summary 1, after 1 Kgs 2:35, occurred at the end of a scroll containing the second half of 2 Samuel (Kingdoms βγ), while summary 2, after 2 Kgs 2:46, occurred at the beginning of the scroll of 3 Kingdoms (Kingdoms γγ).

[35] Schenker, *Septante*, 9 compares the theme summaries with Josh 10:40–42; 12:1–8; 13:2–7; Judg 2:11–3:6, even Judg 1–2:5, but these texts are of a different nature. Most of them indeed include an element of summary of previous stories or data (Judges 1 does not!), but they rephrase the earlier narratives, while most of the summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2 simply repeat complete verses occurring elsewhere. MT contains many additional summaries (for example, summarizing historical accounts like Joshua 24 or historical Psalms like Psalm 106), but none of them creates a mosaic of verses like the theme summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2.

[36] The case of the duplicated verses in the MT of Joshua-Judges, especially in Joshua 24 and Judges 1–2 is a different one, as these duplications resulted from the complicated creation process of these books. Possibly an initially combined book Joshua-Judges was separated into two different ones.

[37] In these chapters the originally short story of the encounter of David and Goliath as narrated in the LXX was joined by an alternative story in MT. See my analysis in "The Composition of 1 Samuel 17–18 in the Light of the Evidence of the Septuagint Version," in Tigay, *Empirical Models,* 97–130. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 333–60; Barthélemy et al., *The Story of David and Goliath.*

[38] This transposition of the tradition about Pharaoh's daughter just before the beginning of Solomon's building activities shows that Solomon gave her a fixed abode only after he finished building the Temple.

3 Kgdms 6:1a–d; 1 Kgs 8:11–12 is placed in 3 Kgdms 8:53a;[39] verses from 1 Kgs 9:15–22 are placed in 1 Kgdms 10:22a–c;[40] etc. This technique is also evidenced elsewhere in the LXX and MT.[41]

4. 3 Kingdoms as a Rewritten Version of 1 Kings

Having established that 3 Kingdoms is based on a Hebrew source, and having described some special techniques used in that composition, we now focus on its nature. The techniques described in the previous paragraph leave no doubt regarding the direction of the changes. The content summaries in chapter 2 are very inappropriate in their context (see n. 34). They would not have appeared in one of the first stages of writing. By the same token, repetition of verses and the juxtaposition of an alternative account are secondary features. Further, the tendencies of this rewritten composition are clearly visible (see below). We therefore believe that, in the main, MT represents an earlier layer in the composition of 1 Kings, and that 3 Kingdoms reflects later rewriting.

The reshaping in 3 Kingdoms involves the addition, repetition, omission, reordering, and changing of large sections as well as small details. These techniques are similar to those used in other compositions in the biblical realm, both within and beyond Greek and Hebrew Scripture. In the past, the techniques of 3 Kingdoms have been compared to those of the Midrash,[42] not only because the rewriting in 1 Kings sometimes resembles Midrash techniques, but also because Gooding located specific parallels with rabbinic literature in subject matter. This is not the place to analyze these parallels, not all of which are equally relevant, but it would perhaps be more appropriate to describe the technique as the rewriting of Scripture.[43] The Hebrew composition behind 3 Kingdoms rewrote a book resembling the composition contained in MT. The comparison with rewritten

[39] According to Gooding, "Text and Midrash," 22–5 the transposition of these verses to v 53a created a new text sequence in the beginning of the Greek chapter 8 in which Solomon is now portrayed in a more pious way. After the glory entered the Temple, the king immediately turned his face away. See also van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 164–80.

[40] The transposition possibly shows that Solomon's measures against the Canaanites are now presented as another token of his wisdom (thus van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 191–201).

[41] Cf. several transpositions elsewhere in the LXX, for which see my paper "Some Sequence Differences between the MT and LXX and Their Ramifications for the Literary Criticism of the Bible," *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 411–18.

[42] Thus especially Gooding (note the name of his summarizing study "Text and Midrash"); V. Peterca, "Ein midraschartiges Auslegungsbeispiel zugunsten Salomos. 1 Kön 8, 12–13–3 Re 8,53a," *BZ* 31 (1987) 270–75. Talshir, "Image," 302 and *Alternative Story,* 277–91 uses the same term.

[43] Talshir, "Image," uses similar terms. The group of rewritten Bible compositions forms a category in its own right described as follows by D. J. Harrington, S. J., "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies," in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations* (ed. R. A. Kraft and G. W. Nickelsburg; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 242–7: "Because they paraphrase the biblical text, they have been called targumic. Because these books interpret biblical texts, they

Bible compositions at Qumran and elsewhere is illuminating, but it also opens up a Pandora's box of problems, as pointed out by Bernstein in another context.[44]

The reshaped compositions, both within and beyond the Greek and Hebrew Scripture canons, were not intended to create new entities. The revisers wanted their new creations to be as close as possible to the old ones, thus ensuring that they would be accepted as authentic. The rewriting sometimes merely involved contextual exegesis, but at other times it included tendentious changes.

Some of the tendencies of the Greek version of 3 Kingdoms, already recognized by Thackeray,[45] were described well by Gooding and van Keulen, *Two Versions*. Gooding presents the simplest analysis by describing the first ten chapters as being rewritten around Solomon's wisdom, including the whitewashing of his sins, chapters 11–14 as presenting a more favorable account of Jeroboam, and chapters 16–22 as whitewashing Ahab.[46] For Gooding, 3 Kingdoms takes the form of a Greek commentary on 1 Kings.[47] Likewise, for van Keulen (*Two Versions*, 300), one of the main features of the first part of this rewritten composition was the presentation of a more favorable picture of Solomon and a rearrangement of the sequence of events (named "pedantic timetabling" by Gooding[48]).

5. Why Only 3 Kingdoms or Why Only 1 Kings?

Before turning to a comparison of the rewriting techniques in the Greek 3 Kingdoms with those in Qumran compositions, we turn to the question regarding why only the OG of 3 Kingdoms or MT of 1 Kings was rewritten within 1–4 Kingdoms.[49] To the best of my knowledge, this issue has not been addressed in the literature.[50] The question can be posed in two different ways referring to either the Greek or Hebrew book.

---

have been seen as midrashic. But careful literary analysis has demonstrated that they are neither Targums nor midrashim" (p. 242).

[44] M. J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible'. See chapter 6*, n. 4.

[45] Thackeray, *Septuagint*, 18. See also by the same author: "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907) 262–78; *Grammar*, 9–10.

[46] Gooding, "Text and Midrash," *passim*.

[47] Gooding, "Text and Midrash," 28.

[48] D. W. Gooding, "Pedantic Timetabling in the 3rd Book of Reigns," *VT* 15 (1965) 153–66.

[49] Greek Scripture contains an amalgam of old and new, namely the OG versions of Kingdoms α and ββ and γγ (see n. 1) and the *kaige*-Th revision of Kingdoms βγ and γδ.

[50] A related question has been posed, namely why does 3 Kingdoms start at its present place in 1 Kgs 2:12, but no fully acceptable reply has been offered to that question. Thackeray, *Septuagint*, 18 merely distinguished between the OG and revised sections (see previous note), but he did not realize that the OG sections differ much among themselves. According to Thackeray, the sections that now contain the *kaige*-Th revision "were omitted as unedifying by the early translators" (p. 18; similarly: "Greek Translators," 263). Another related question was answered by Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 140–41: why was section βγ (2 Sam 11:2–1 Kgs 2:11) revised by *kaige*-Th? Barthélemy suggested that the translator wished to correct the chapters relating to the "failures and calamities of the house of David." These chapters were not covered well in the

i. Did the rewriting in the *Greek* 3 Kingdoms once cover also 1–2, and 4 Kingdoms? Since we do not know why 3 Kingdoms would have been singled out for content rewriting, it is possible that all four books of Samuel-Kings (or just the two books of Kings) were rewritten in Hebrew and that the rewritten versions were rendered into Greek. The issue is complex, since we have no access to the OG translation of all of 1–4 Kingdoms any more. However, we do have the OG translations of 1 Samuel (Kingdoms α) and the first half of 2 Samuel (Kingdoms ββ), and they do *not* reflect any rewriting such as in 3 Kingdoms. If these two segments were translated by the person who rendered 3 Kingdoms, as is likely,[51] we do not know why 3 Kingdoms differs so drastically from 1–2 and 4 Kingdoms.[52] We therefore conclude that it is unlikely that a *Greek* rewritten text of all of 1–4 or 1–2 Kingdoms ever existed.

ii. Did a *Hebrew* version of 1–2 Samuel and 2 Kings that rewrote MT in a similar way to the Hebrew source of 3 Kingdoms once exist? This option is very well possible. The Hebrew 1 Kings was probably contained in one of the two scrolls of Kings. We suggest that the OG translator mistakenly used a mixed set of Hebrew scrolls for his translation, one scroll of the rewritten type (1 Kings) and three unrevised scrolls.[53] This theory cannot be verified, since the OG translations of Kingdoms βγ and γδ have been lost. Crucial to this scenario is the assumption of the use of scrolls of different types, which would have been understandable due to the scarcity of scrolls. Equally crucial is the assumption that at least the two Hebrew books of Kings were included in two separate scrolls. Support for this suggestion comes from the realm of the LXX, where a shift in translation character in some books has been ascribed to the use of different scrolls in the archetype of Greek Scripture.[54] There is no direct support from Qumran for the

---

OG, and because there existed no Greek version of these chapters in Chronicles, their correction was an urgent task for the reviser.

[51] Thackeray, "Greek Translators," produces some evidence for the distinction between the translations of 1 Samuel and 1 Kings, but the evidence (pp. 274–6) is not convincing. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts" (see n. 17) assumes the unity of the OG of Kingdoms α, ββ, γγ (p. 45), while focusing on the relation between these sections and the "Lucianic" manuscripts in Kingdoms βγ, γδ. D. Barthélemy describes the OG as "composite," but he only refers to the internal problems of 3 Kingdoms: "Prise de position sur les communications du colloque de Los Angeles," *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg/Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires/ Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 255–88 (258).

[52] It cannot be countered that the content of these two books differed from 3 Kingdoms, since also 1 Kingdoms and the first part of 2 Kingdoms provide sufficient occasion for rewriting, especially in the stories about Saul and David.

[53] The circulation of four different scrolls, although of different sizes and of a different nature, was also assumed by Barthélemy, "Prise de position," 257 (cf. n. 51 above). For extensive analysis of this possibility, see my study "The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures," *Congress Volume Ljubliana,* 2007, forthcoming.

[54] For the bisection of 2 Samuel, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel in the LXX scrolls, see E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976) 161–65. Likewise, in

writing of the Hebrew book of Kings in two separate scrolls. The only (negative) evidence relates to the books 1–2 Samuel that are joined in 4QSam[a].[55] On the other hand, the great majority of the other Scripture books, including those of the Torah and the Five Scrolls, are contained in separate scrolls.[56] This evidence does support the assumption that 1–2 Kings would have been contained in two different scrolls.

B. Esther

1. Background of the Discrepancies between MT and the LXX

An evaluation of the differences between Esth-LXX and MT poses many challenges.[57] The LXX is very free and sometimes paraphrastic; it also contains six large narrative expansions (the so-called Additions A–F) that are traditionally considered to be independent units. However, the use of the term "Additions" gives a false impression of their nature and may lead to wrong conclusions. They are better described as narrative Expansions A–F, adding more than 50% to the amount of words in the Greek book.[58]

A correct understanding of Esth-LXX is relevant to the textual and literary analysis of the book. In as far as a consensus exists regarding the textual value of the Greek version of Esther, it is negative.[59] This view is challenged in the present study. We suggest that (1) Esth-LXX represents a free translation as is shown

---

the classical world large compositions were subdivided into independent units (scrolls), often regardless of their content. See Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Literatur* (Berlin 1882; repr. Aalen: Scientia-Verlag, 1974) 131–40; H. Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven, Conn./London: Yale University Press, 1995) 42–66 with references to earlier literature.

[55] However, the division of scrolls for Samuel was not necessarily identical to the one in Kings.

[56] A few Torah scrolls contained two books. For details, see *Scribal Practices*, 74–9.

[57] While several monographs, some of them book-length, have been devoted to the "Lucianic" version, also named A-Text or AT, in recent decennia little attention has been paid to the LXX version.

[58] Due to the uncertainty pertaining to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, a comparison of the length of the LXX and MT is little more than an exercise. According to the calculations of C. V. Dorothy, *The Books of Esther–Structure, Genre, and Textual Integrity* (JSOTSup 187; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 16 the LXX added 77% to MT, the AT text 45%, and Josephus 32%.

[59] This judgment was probably best formulated by D. J. A. Clines, *The Esther Scroll – The Story of the Story* (JSOTSup 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984) 69: "Almost everyone agrees, however, that no matter how free the Septuagint translator has been, it is essentially the Masoretic Hebrew text that was his *Vorlage*." A similar view had been expressed earlier by Th. Nöldeke in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, *s. v.* "Esther" (ed. T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black; London: A. & C. Black, 1899–1903) II.1406: "The tendency, so common at the present day, to overestimate the importance of the LXX for purposes of textual criticism is nowhere more to be deprecated than in the Book of Esther. It may be doubted whether even in a single passage of the book the Greek manuscripts enable us to emend the Hebrew text."

by an analysis of its translation technique, and (2) it sometimes paraphrases its Hebrew parent text. We add a new dimension to the analysis when asserting (3) that some paraphrases were triggered by the translator's misunderstanding of the Hebrew. These issues are addressed in a separate study.[60] For the present analysis, it is important to note that Esth-LXX reflects some Hebrew variants, that the original language of Expansions A, C, D, and F in the LXX was Hebrew, and that the Greek translations of the canonical sections and the expansions were produced by the same person and reflect a rewritten Hebrew composition.

2. Esth-LXX Reflects Some Variants in Small Details

That Esth-LXX reflects Hebrew variants in small details hardly needs any proof, since all books of the LXX reflect such variants. Nevertheless, this point needs to be mentioned since most scholars assert that this translation is of little use for text-critical purposes (see n. 59).

3. Expansions A, C, D, and F Were Translated from a Hebrew Source

Most scholars believe that the original language of Expansions A, C, D, and F was Hebrew or Aramaic,[61] and that Expansions B and E were composed in Greek.[62] Martin's linguistic study that identified the original language of Expansions A, C, D, and F as Greek with the aid of seventeen syntactical features used as criteria to distinguish between "Greek-original" and "translation Greek" is especially valuable.[63] In addition, καὶ ἰδού = והנה in A 4, 5, 7 and the wording of A 3, 17 also indicate that the Expansions were based on a Hebrew text.[64]

---

[60] "The LXX Translation of Esther: A Paraphrastic Translation of MT or a Free Translation of a Rewritten Version?" *Festschrift P. van der Horst*, forthcoming.

[61] See J. Langen, "Die beiden griechischen Texte des Buches Esther," *Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift* 42 (1860) 244–72, especially 264–6; A. Scholz, *Commentar über das Buch "Esther" mit seinen "Zusätzen" und über "Susanna"* (Würzburg/Vienna: Leo Woerl, 1892) xxi–xxiii; C. A. Moore, "On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther," *JBL* 92 (1973) 382–93; idem, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*, 155. Nevertheless, some scholars maintain that the Expansions were written in Greek, without providing detailed philological arguments. Thus Jellicoe, *Septuagint*, 295 asserts "It is generally agreed that the additions to Esther are based on no Hebrew or Aramaic original, but are additions in the interests of piety."

[62] These two Expansions are close in style and content to 3 Maccabees, see Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*, 195–9.

[63] R. A. Martin, "Syntax Criticism of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther," *JBL* 94 (1975) 65–72.

[64] In other instances the assumption of Hebrew diction is less convincing since the wording could also have been influenced by the canonical sections: A 1 ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμιν (= משבט בנימין) equals the description of Mordecai in 2:5 LXX as opposed to MT ימיני איש, a Benjaminite. Presumably LXX 2:5 reflects the same reading as A 1. A 2 ἐν Σούσοις τῇ πόλει = בשושן הבירה (= 1:2; 9:12) and A 13 "Artaxerxes the king" (= 2:16, 21; 3:12).

4. Unity of the Greek Translation of the Canonical Text and the Expansions

Determining the relation between the Greek versions of the canonical sections and the Greek Expansions is crucial to our understanding of Esth-LXX. Since Expansions A, C, D, and F were originally written in Hebrew, one's first intuition would be that they belonged to the same composition as the canonical sections. The segments originally written in Greek (Expansions B, E) were probably created by the translator.[65]

There is no reason to distrust the ancient evidence of all manuscripts according to which all the elements of Esth-LXX indeed represent one integral unit that formed the basis for Josephus, *Ant*. 184–296 (B–E). We should not be influenced by Jerome's removal of Expansions A–F from their context, thereby mutilating the translation.[66] His action was arbitrary and inconsistent since by the same token one could excise equally large segments from the Greek translation of 3 Kingdoms (for example, 3 Kgdms 2:35a–o, 46, a-l; 12:24a–z) and place them at the end of the book.[67] Furthermore, the canonical segments and the Expansions are intertwined in an organic way in chapters 4 and 5, making it impossible to mark an uninterrupted group of verses as constituting "Expansion D."[68] The unity

[65] Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah,* 166 recognizes the Hebrew background of most of the Expansions, but treats them as an entity separate from the translation of the canonical segments. Moore does not discuss evidence such as adduced in this paragraph, so that the possibility that these Expansions derive from the translator himself is not even mentioned by him.

[66] W.H. Brownlee, "Le livre grec d'Esther et la royauté divine – corrections orthodoxes au livre d'Esther," *RB* 73 (1966) 161–85 (162) uses this term.

[67] By doing so one would "improve" the Greek translation of 3 Kingdoms, since these sections are clearly secondary in the context. See above, A.

[68] The scope of D is presented in different ways in the text editions. The edition of Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* indicates the different origin of the sixteen verses of Expansion D by distinguishing in its numbering system between the canonical text and Expansion D. However, the edition of R. Hanhart, *Esther, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum*, VIII, 3 (2d edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983) and the NETS translation by A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* (Oxford: Clarendon, forthcoming) present these verses in the traditional way as "Addition D." By doing so, they conceal the canonical status of 5:1–2 that form part of that expansion. These two editions present the text following 4:17 as Addition C ("Prayers of Mordecai and Esther") immediately continued with Addition D ("Esther's Audience with the King") including the canonical verses 5:1–2. In these two editions 5:1 is named D 1 (that is, the first verse in the "apocryphal" Addition D), and 5:2 is named D 12 located in the midst of an expansion counting 16 verses. These complications come to light even more so in the Vulgate where these verses are duplicated. The main text of V translates the Hebrew, including 5:1–2, while these verses are repeated in the so-called Additions (based on the LXX) that are placed at the end of the book. Addition D is named here "chapter 15."

The verses are thus indicated as follows in the editions:
Canonical verse 5:1 Rahlfs = D 1 Göttingen
Added verses 1:a–f Rahlfs = D 2–11 Göttingen
Canonical verse 5:2 Rahlfs = D 12 Göttingen
Added verses 2a–b Rahlfs = D 13–15 Göttingen
Canonical verse 5:3 Rahlfs = 5:3 Göttingen

of the canonical text and the narrative Expansions is further supported by several close connections between the two segments.[69]

In light of the preceding analysis, it is suggested that the *Vorlage* of Esth-LXX included the so-called Expansions A, C, D, and F.[70] The royal edicts in Expansions B and E were probably added by the translator himself.[71]

5. Esth-LXX Reflects a Rewritten Version of a Hebrew Composition Similar to MT

If the premises of §§ 1–4 are correct, the *Vorlage* of Esth-LXX reflects a Hebrew[72] composition that rewrote a book similar to MT. Conflicting features recognized in the translation complicate the reconstruction of the parent text of Esth-LXX:

---

[69] See Tov, "The LXX of Esther" (see n. 60 above). The translation of Daniel includes several long additions now considered "apocryphal." However, those additions do not form an integral part of the story, as in Esther. Furthermore it is unclear whether there ever existed an expanded Semitic book of Daniel on which the Greek translation would have been based. By the same token, there never existed an expanded Semitic book of Jeremiah that included Baruch even though one translator rendered both Jeremiah and Baruch. See Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch* (see n. 54 above).

[70] The basic unity of the translation and the "apocryphal" Additions is maintained also by Bickerman, "Notes," 246, but for him this unity pertained to the book in its Greek shape: "The Greek Esther, of which the "Rest Chapters" are integral and essential parts, is not the *Megillath Esther,* couched in Greek language and letters, but its adaptation designed for the Diaspora." The following critical commentaries of the Hebrew book of Esther incorporate the six Expansions of the LXX in their natural contexts so as to cater to different audiences: L. B. Paton, *The Book of Esther* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908); J. D. Levenson, *Esther, A Commentary* (OTL; London, SCM Press, 1997) 28.

[71] Therefore, the view of Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*, 155 "All six of the Additions to Esther are secondary, i. e. they were supplied after the Book of Esther had been written" cannot be substantiated. This view, shared by many scholars, is probably influenced by the position of the Expansions at the end of the book. By the same token, the suggestion that these Expansions, or some of them, were rendered from Aramaic is without base since it is based on the assumption that the Expansions had a separate existence. For this suggestion, see A. Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (HTS 20; Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1964) 62; Moore, "Origins," 393 (see n. 61 above) regarding Addition C. Clines, *Esther* (see n. 59 above) who describes the development of the various texts in a diagram (p. 140), suggests that the original translation of Esther was made from a Hebrew original that did not contain the Expansions. However, elsewhere (p. 186, n. 3 relating to p. 71) he admits, "I must confess that I cannot prove this nor can I reconstruct the process by which the LXX acquired Additions from two sources."

[72] Bickerman considers Esth-LXX a *Greek* Midrash, but in spite of the thoroughness of his study "Notes," he does not prove the following statements: "… the translation reflects an adaptation designed for the Diaspora." ("Notes," 246) … "Further, being read in the Synagogue and describing the origin of a feast, the story of Esther naturally attracted haggadic embellishments." ("Notes," p. 255) … "The Hebrew Esther being no sacred writing, Lysimachus <i. e. the name of the translator of Esth-LXX according to the colophon of the book, E. T.> was free to adapt the original to the needs and requirements of the Greek-speaking Jews" (257).

a. Esth-LXX reflects a free translation of its source.

b. The source text reflects a Hebrew composition different from MT (§§ 2–4).

These features may require the revision of some of our earlier assumptions:

i. It is not impossible that some of the features ascribed to the free translation character of Esth-LXX in §§ 1–2 derived from its deviating Hebrew *Vorlage*. Thus, some short LXX readings in small details vis-à-vis MT as well as some of the presumed clarifications could have derived from a different *Vorlage*.

ii. By the same token, some of the features ascribed to the translator's deviating parent text could be assigned to his freedom.[73]

It seems to me that we can still maintain the view that the translation is free, while at the same time embarking on the reconstruction of some elements in the Hebrew parent text of the translation. My point of departure is that the Greek translation forms an integral unity that includes the Expansions, that Expansions A, C, D, and F are based on a Hebrew source, and that this composition reworked MT rather than *vice versa*. The reverse process is not likely, the main argument being the revisional tendencies visible in Esth-LXX, such as the addition to the story in the LXX of a religious background, also known from the Midrash (see n. 75). We assume that this composition inserted the phrase *wa-yehi ahar ha-debarim ha-'eleh* in v 1 to accommodate for the addition of Mordecai's dream (Expansion A) before the beginning of the canonical book.

Therefore, we regard Esth-LXX as a free translation of a rewritten version of MT rather than a paraphrastic translation.[74]

6. Characteristic Features of the Hebrew Source of Esth-LXX

The following features characterize the rewriting in the Hebrew source of Esth-LXX:

i. The addition of large *narrative expansions* at key points in the story: A and F before the beginning and after the end ("Mordecai's Dream" and its "Interpretation"), as well as C ("Prayers of Mordecai and Esther") and D ("Esther's Audience with the King") after chapter 4.

---

[73] *BHQ* ascribes many instances to the freedom of the translator that in our view reflect Hebraistic renderings or Hebrew variants. Among other things, most instances described in *BHQ* as "abbr" probably reflect a shorter Hebrew parent text. For example, 1:1 "to Nubia," 1:13 "learned in procedure," 2:6 "in the group that was carried into exile along with King Jeconiah of Judah," 2:19 "when the virgins were assembled a second time," 2:21 "Bigthan and Teresh," 3:10 "son of Hammedatha the Agagite, the foe of the Jews," 3:13 "on the thirteenth day," 6:8 "and on whose head a royal diadem has been set," 8:7 "and to the Jew Mordecai," etc.

[74] In our view, the A-Text of Esther reflects a similar rewritten composition of a text like the MT of that book, but it did not enjoy any authoritative status. See my study "The 'Lucianic' Text of the Canonical and the Apocryphal Sections of Esther: A Rewritten Biblical Book," *Textus* 10 (1982) 1–25. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 535–48.

ii. Probably the most characteristic feature of the LXX is the addition of a *religious background* to the earlier MT version that lacks the mentioning of God's name. These details are added not only in the large Expansions but also in small pluses such as 2:20; 4:8; 6:13. Likewise, God's involvement is mentioned everywhere in the Midrash and Targum.[75]

iii. The addition of *new ideas* in small details. For example, the identification of Ahashuerus as Artaxerxes; the description of the first banquet as a wedding feast for Vashti (1:5, 11); length of the second banquet (1:5); the description of the opulence at the banquet (1:5–6); the identification of Mehuman as Haman (1:10); the king's active participation in the hanging of the two eunuchs (2:23) and of Haman (8:7); the king's placing the ring on Haman's hand (3:10); the naming of Haman as a Macedonian (E 10; 9:24); Esther's concern for her own safety (8:6).

iv. The *removal* of some phrases that may have been considered verbose or less important (e. g. 3:12, 13; 5:6) as well as the *addition* of some clarifications. Admittedly, it is hard to distinguish between changes made at the Hebrew level and similar changes made by the Greek translator.

C. Daniel 4–6

The relationship between many details in MT and LXX in Daniel 4–6[76] cannot be determined easily, but most scholars believe that the LXX reflects a later reworking of a book resembling MT, while occasionally the LXX reflects an earlier form.[77] Some scholars go as far as to argue that the LXX of Daniel as a whole preceded MT.[78] Because of complications like these, the two versions could also

[75] Thus Esther's concern for dietary laws in C 27–28 should be compared with *b. Meg*. 13a, *Targum Rishon,* and *Targum Sheni* 2:20. See B. Grossfeld, *The Two Targums of Esther, Translated with Apparatus and Notes* (ArBib 18; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991). For LXX Esth 2:7 "he trained her for himself as a wife" (MT "Mordecai adopted her <Esther> as his own daughter") cf. *b. Meg*. 13a "A Tanna taught in the name of R. Meir: Read not "for a daughter" [*le-bat*], but "for a house" [*le-bayit*] <that is, a wife>." For a different view on the relation between the LXX and the Midrash, see M. Zipor, "When Midrash Met Septuagint: The Case of Esther 2,7," *ZAW* 118 (2006) 82–92.

[76] It remains puzzling why the two sources are so divergent in chapters 3 and 4–6, and not in the remainder of the book. J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; T & T Clark; Edinburgh, 1964) 36 and J. Collins*, A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994) 7 suggested that these chapters may have circulated separately.

[77] For example, in 4:3–6 MT describes a competition between Daniel and the magicians not found in the LXX. MT is problematic, since the magicians are found unable to interpret a dream before its content is described.

[78] Thus Albertz, *Daniel*; O. Munnich, "Texte Massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel," in *Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible*, 93–120.

be presented as two independent works that revised an earlier composition.[79] Be that as it may, in the main, the parent text of the LXX revises an earlier text resembling MT.[80] The Semitic substratum[81] of the Greek text is often visible.[82]

Three examples of the rewriting in the LXX follow:

i. A composition very similar to the MT of chapter 4[83] has been reworked in the LXX. The LXX changed, added, and omitted many details.[84] Among other things, the Greek text places the opening verses of chapter 4 (3:31–33 in MT) later in the chapter, in a greatly expanded form, as v 34c.[85] The story in MT starts with these verses, which contain the king's confession of guilt and his recognition of God's greatness, while in the LXX they are found at the end of the account in the form of a doxology, as in 6:26–27 and elsewhere.

ii. MT has a tendency to change details in the wording of the dream in chapter 4 to agree with the subsequent description of its interpretation. The LXX goes one step further by reporting the fulfillment of the command within the dream itself, in the added verse 14a (17a). This long verse, which repeats the wording of the

---

[79] Thus, according to Ulrich, the *parallel* editions of both MT and the LXX (OG) expanded an earlier text form in different ways: E. Ulrich, "Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated," in idem, *DSS*, 34–50, esp. 40–44. This view was developed on the basis of the Notre Dame dissertations by D. O. Wenthe and S. P. Jeansonne mentioned there.

[80] The revisional character of the LXX is described in detail by R. Grelot, "La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique," *RB* 81 (1974) 5–23; idem, "La chapitre V de Daniel dans la Septante," *Sem* 24 (1974) 45–66. Collins, *Daniel,* 4–11, 216–20, 241–3 (see n. 76 above) makes many judicious remarks on the relation between the two texts.

[81] Montgomery, *Daniel*, 37, 248 (see n. 76 above) argued for an Aramaic substratum, while Grelot, "Daniel IV" assumed a Hebrew parent text.

[82] According to Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls,* 43, the Greek translation was "a consistent, unified document with a consistent translation technique. Therefore, the significant variation between the OG and the MT in 4–6 seems to indicate that the OG is a faithful translation of a different literary edition of these chapters." If this judgment is correct, we have good insights into the Aramaic parent text of the LXX. Even if this judgment about the translation technique is only partially correct, at least major aspects of the Aramaic text underlying the LXX can be reconstructed.

[83] The MT of this chapter tells of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of an enormous tree that provides shelter and food for many. By divine decree, the tree is felled with only its stump left remaining in the ground (vv 1–14). Daniel's interpretation indicates that the dream referred to the king and he tries to convince him to atone for his sins (vv 15–24). However, the king's subsequent behavior attests to arrogance and madness (vv 25–30). Finally, the king turns to God, is fully rehabilitated, and is returned to power as king (vv 31–34).

[84] The exegetical expansions of the LXX depend much on the language and imagery of the stories and dreams in chapters 2–3 and 5–7. The LXX reflects various theological interpretations that may derive from either the translator or the rewritten Aramaic composition. Thus, all verses referring to Daniel possessing a "spirit of the Holy God" are lacking in the LXX (4:5–6; 5:11, 14), the phrase "Most High" is added to MT (vv 11, 21), and the king's mania is described as resulting from his destruction of Jerusalem (vv 1, 19).

[85] The position of these verses at the end of the Greek chapter is probably secondary as they refer to the future, although the events themselves have already been described in the preceding verses: "And now, I *will* show to you the deeds that the great God has done with me (v 34c)."

earlier verses, reports the cutting down of the tree and its metamorphosis, now symbolizing the king, into a beast: "He ate grass with the animals of the earth …" (for the wording, cf. v 12).

iii. Preceding the beginning of chapter 5 (King Belshazzar's banquet and the writing on the wall), the LXX adds a summary of the chapter that is neither matched by MT nor Theodotion's version. This summary includes a new element, namely the transliterated inscription written on the wall (v 25), which is not included in the LXX version. The summary partially duplicates the content of the chapter; thus it begins with the same words as v 1 that introduce the king's feast. There are also differences in details between the summary on the one hand and MT and the LXX on the other. Therefore, this addition must have summarized a slightly different form of the chapter.[86] The underlying text of the summary was Aramaic.[87] The summary may be compared to the theme summaries in the LXX of 3 Kingdoms 2 (see above, A). The two summaries use different techniques, since the summary in Daniel recaps the events told in the chapter, while the LXX of 3 Kingdoms 2 duplicates verses around a common theme.

D. Comparison of the Three LXX Books with Rewritten Bible Compositions in Hebrew

The Hebrew sources of the translations of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel freely rewrote their source texts in a manner resembling other rewritten Bible compositions. It remains unclear why these three books[88] were singled out for reworking. The Hebrew/Aramaic versions of Esther and Daniel share certain features at the content and language level,[89] but these features are not shared with 1 Kings. One possible reason may be the similar milieu in which these translations were created. Another possibility would be the assumption that the three translations were created at a later stage than most other Greek translations. At that time such rewritten Hebrew/Aramaic books were circulating, and less so in earlier periods.

We now expand our observations to other rewritten Hebrew Bible compositions as found among the Qumran scrolls and in SP.

---

[86] Thus J. Lust, "The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4–5," in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; BETL 106; Leuven: Peeters, 1993) 39–53 (40); Albertz, *Daniel*, 81.

[87] Grelot, "La chapitre V" (see n. 80 above); Collins, *Daniel*, 241 (see n. 76).

[88] To the best of my knowledge, the only scholar who recognized parallels between these three books is Z. Talshir in a brief note in her paper "Synchronic Approaches," 78, n. 2 (Heb.). See n. 1 above.

[89] See Collins, *Daniel*, 40.

The Samaritan version of the Torah rewrote a composition like MT. The rewriting is partial, as all rewriting, but it is manifest. In the main, the rewriting in SP does not bear a Samaritan character, since earlier non-sectarian texts from Qumran (named pre-Samaritan)[90] carry the exact same content as the SP. However, SP goes its own way by adding a small number of Samaritan sectarian readings. Together these texts are named the "SP group."

Some of the Hebrew Qumran compositions likewise resemble the rewriting in the LXX books, even more so than the SP group. The best-preserved rewritten Bible texts[91] from Qumran are 11QT[a] cols. LI–LXVI, the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), and Jubilees.[92] These parallels strengthen our aforementioned assertions relating to the rewriting in some LXX books and reversely the LXX helps us in clarifying the canonical status of the Qumran compositions.

The main feature these compositions and the SP group have in common with the reconstructed sources of the LXX translations relates to the interaction between the presumably original Scripture text and exegetical additions. All the Qumran compositions present long stretches of Scripture text, interspersed with short or long exegetical additions,.[93] 11QT[a] cols. LI–LXVI (constituting a paraphrase of the legal chapters of Deuteronomy)[94] changes the text sequence frequently and adds several completely new sections (for example, cols. LVII:1–LIX:21, providing the statutes of the king).[95]

The recognition of a group of rewritten Bible compositions at Qumran and elsewhere is accepted among scholars, even though they disagree with regard to the characterization of specific compositions[96] and the terminology used for the group as a whole.[97]

In the past, the LXX translations were not associated with the Qumran rewritten Bible texts. When making this link, we recognize the similarity in the rewrit-

---

[90] Especially 4QpaleoExod[m] and 4QNum[b]. See chapter 6* for a detailed analysis.

[91] For the evidence and an analysis, see G. J. Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," in *Encyclopedia DSS* 2:777–81; E. Tov, "Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant, The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994) 111–34; M. Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005) 10–29; Harrington, "Palestinian Adaptations" (see n. 43 above).

[92] Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* and Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* also provide valuable parallels, but they are more remote from the biblical realm.

[93] See chapter 10*, n. 64.

[94] The close relation between that scroll and Hebrew Scripture is reflected in the name given to the scroll by B. Z. Wacholder and M. Abegg, "The Fragmentary Remains of 11QTorah (Temple Scroll)," *HUCA* 62 (1991) 1–116.

[95] For additional material supplementary to the Pentateuchal laws, see the list in Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1.46–70.

[96] See n. 117 below with regard to 4QRP.

[97] See Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible" (see n. 44 above).

ing style of Scripture books. More specifically, the LXX translations meet some of the characterizing criteria that Segal set for rewritten Bible compositions: new narrative frame, expansion together with abridgement, and a tendentious editorial layer.[98] In all these matters, the "three strange books" in the LXX resemble several rewritten Bible texts from Qumran and elsewhere, as well as SP and 4QRP (see below). We will now review the similarities in techniques:

1. *3 Kingdoms*. Two of the central techniques used in 3 Kingdoms, not known from MT or Greek Scripture, were used in the SP group, viz., the duplication of various sections in 3 Kingdoms and the insertion of theme summaries in chapter 2.

i. *Duplication.* Central to the literary principles of the SP group is the wish to rewrite Hebrew Scripture based on its editorial tendencies without adding new text pericopes. The addition of new passages would have harmed the authenticity of the rewritten Bible compositions, and therefore the SP group limited itself to copying passages. For this purpose they duplicated, for example, all the segments of Moses' first speech in Deuteronomy 1–3 in Exodus and Numbers as foreshadowers of Deuteronomy.[99] In the SP group and 3 Kingdoms, the duplications have a different purpose. In 3 Kingdoms, they serve an exegetical or chronological purpose, while in the SP group the duplication of segments from Deuteronomy in Exodus and Numbers is meant to make the earlier books comply with Moses' speech in Deuteronomy 1–3.[100]

ii. *Theme summaries.* In the beginning of the Greek book the two collections of verses in 3 Kingdoms 2 summarize verses relating to the central theme of chapters 3–10, Solomon's wisdom. By the same token, the added[101] tenth commandment of SP (not found in the pre-Samaritan texts) is a theme summary of verses describing the sanctity of Mt. Gerizim. The tenth commandment of SP in both versions of the Decalogue describing and prescribing the sanctity of Mount Gerizim is made up of verses occurring elsewhere in Deuteronomy.[102]

2. *Esth-LXX*. The Hebrew source of Esth-LXX rewrote a composition very similar to MT. The most salient technique used in the course of the rewriting is the addition of the large Expansions A, C, D, and F. These expansions expand the story in a meaningful way. The interaction of the previous Scripture text and the long expansions may be compared with the relation between the Qumran rewritten

[98] Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 20–26.

[99] For a detailed analysis, see chapter 6*.

[100] A similar duplication is found in 4QDeut^{n} V 5–7 where the motive clause for the Sabbath commandment in Exod 20:11 has been added after the motive clause of Deuteronomy. See J. H. Tigay, "Conflation as a Redactional Technique," in Tigay, *Empirical Models,* 53–96 (55–7).

[101] The Samaritans consider the first commandment of the Jewish tradition as a preamble to the Decalogue, so that in their tradition there is room for an additional commandment.

[102] Deut 11:29a, 27:2b–3a, 27:4a, 27:5–7, 11:30 – in that sequence.

Bible compositions and their presumed sources. All these rewritten compositions exercise freedom towards their underlying texts by adding large expansions wherever their authors wished.

3. *Daniel*

i. *Command and execution*. The technique used in the LXX addition in 4:14a (17a), which relates the execution of God's command of vv 11–14 (14–17), is known from several other compositions. The closest parallel is the story of the Ten Plagues in Exodus 7–11 in the SP group. In this story, the SP group expanded the description of God's commands to Moses and Aaron to warn Pharaoh before each plague by adding a detailed account of their execution.[103] That these additions are not only typical of these texts is shown by the similar addition of the execution of Kish's command to Saul in 1 Sam 9:3 in LXX^{Luc} and the Peshitta.

ii. *Summaries*. The summary description of the events of Daniel 5 that is placed at its beginning reminds us of the theme summaries in 3 Kingdoms 2 and in the SP.[104]

In short, in their major features the Hebrew/Aramaic sources of the "three strange books" in the LXX resemble several rewritten Bible texts from Qumran and elsewhere.

E. Text and Canon

The recognition that the Greek versions of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel represent rewritten versions of MT has important implications for our understanding of the canonical status of these translations and of canonical issues in general. All three Greek books were considered to be authoritative by ancient Judaism and Christianity alike. In due course, they were rejected within Judaism, but for Christianity they remained authoritative in different ways.

It is no coincidence that two of the three books (Esther, Daniel) suffered a similar fate within the Christian canon, since they have much in common. They share large expansions that were considered secondary and therefore were ultimately removed from the running text in the case of Esther. The large expansions

---

[103] For example, after Exod 8:19 SP and 4QpaleoExod^{m}, following the formulation of vv 16 ff. add: "And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and said to him: 'Thus says the Lord: Let my people go that they may worship Me. For if you do not let my people go, I will let loose …'" Similar additions are found in 4QpaleoExod^{m} and SP after 7:18, 29; 9:5, 19.

[104] The nature of the rewriting has been described in the studies listed in n. 91, but whether the rewriting in 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel is adequately covered by these descriptions still needs to be examined. Attention also needs to be given to the question of whether or not the rewritten editions were intended to replace the older ones. We believe that this was the intention of the three mentioned rewritten books. The rewritten ed. II of Jeremiah (MT) likewise was meant to replace the earlier ed. I (LXX, 4QJer^{b,d}); see n. 5.

of Esth-LXX now have a deutero-canonical status in the Catholic Church even though they never existed separately. At the same time, the medium-sized expansions were left in the text. The medium-sized expansions of Daniel were likewise left in the text (4:17a, 33a–b, 37a–c). However, two book-sized appendixes were placed at the beginning or end of the book (Susanna, Bel and the Serpent), while the large Expansion named the "Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men"[105] was left in the text between 3:23 and 3:24 but given deutero-canonical status. 3 Kingdoms could have undergone the same fate, but all the expansions including the large ones in chapters 2 and 12 were left in the text.

When the LXX translation was produced, the Hebrew source of 3 Kingdoms was considered to be as authoritative as 1 Kings, at least in some circles. Otherwise it would not have been rendered into Greek. This pertains also to the assumed Hebrew (Aramaic?) sources of Esther and Daniel.[106] The Greek translators and the Alexandrian Jewish community considered the original Hebrew and Aramaic versions, as well as their Greek translations, as authoritative as Baruch[107] or any other book included in those collections.

Several scholars assume that the canonical conceptions behind the "Alexandrian canon" reflect the views of the mother community in Palestine.[108] The link with Palestine is even closer for Esther, as there is strong evidence that this book was translated in that country.[109]

The Greek canon includes 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel, constituting rewritten versions of earlier books such as now included in MT. The rewritten books were considered authoritative in their Semitic as well as Greek forms, although by different communities. SP, likewise a rewritten version of MT, as well as its pre-Samaritan forerunners, enjoyed similar authority. Rewritten versions, as well as the earlier versions on which they were based (for example, the MT of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel), were considered equally authoritative, by different communities and in different periods.

---

[105] Although placed in the text itself, this added text is usually believed to have enjoyed a separate existence. This addition is composed of three or four separate compositions: the Prayer of Azariah (vv 1–22), the prose narrative (vv 23–28), the Ode (vv 29–34), and the Psalm (vv 35–68). See Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah*, 40–76.

[106] See Collins, *Daniel,* 195–207, 405–39.

[107] This book was translated by the same translator who rendered Jeremiah into Greek and was revised by the same reviser who revised at least the second part of the LXX of Jeremiah. See my study *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch* (see n. 54 above).

[108] Especially Sundberg, *The Old Testament*, 60–65 (see n. 71 above).

[109] The main manuscripts of the LXX contain a note at the end of the book, the only such note in the LXX, translated by Bickerman, "Notes," 245 as follows: "In the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra <78–77 BCE>, Dositheus –who said he was a priest,– and Levitas, and Ptolemy his son deposited the preceding Letter of Purim, which they said really exists and had been translated by Lysimachus (son of) Ptolemy, (a member) of the Jerusalem community." The implication of this note is that the Greek version of Esther was produced in Jerusalem and deposited (*eisfero*) in the year 78–77 BCE in an archive in Egypt.

This brings us back to the rewritten Bible compositions found at Qumran. We do not know to what extent these compositions were accepted at Qumran or elsewhere, if at all, but probably at least some of the "non-canonical" books were accepted as authoritative by that community.[110] Jubilees, represented by 15–16 copies at Qumran, may have had such a status.[111] The same may be said about 4Q–11QTemple, but several types of evidence need to be taken into consideration.[112] The decision is very difficult since no group has survived, like Judaism, Christianity or the Samaritans, that endorsed some of these compositions. Because of the lack of convincing evidence relating to all the rewritten compositions we turn to the one composition which from the point of view of its contents is so close to Hebrew Scripture and to the rewritten works within Greek Scripture that it probably enjoyed the same authoritative status as Greek Scripture. We refer to 4QReworked Pentateuch.[113] This composition, published as a non-biblical composition, has to be reclassified as a Bible manuscript similar in character to some of the rewritten LXX books like 3 Kingdoms.[114] Among the Qumran rewritten Bible compositions this text, previously described as a rewritten composition, exhibits the longest stretches of uninterrupted text that may be classified as Scripture as found in either MT or the pre-Samaritan text. This composition also rearranges some Torah pericopes.[115] As far as we can tell, 4QRP has a relatively small number of extensive additions. The exegetical character of this composition is especially evident from several pluses comprising 1–2 lines

[110] For an analysis, see G. J. Brooke, "Rewritten Bible" (see n. 91 above).

[111] Jubilees is quoted expressly in CD 16 2–3: "As for the exact determination of their times to which Israel turns a blind eye, behold it is strictly defined in the *Book of the Divisions of the Times into their Jubilees and Weeks*." The book is written as authoritative Scripture, with God announcing Israel's future to Moses on Sinai. For an analysis, see J. VanderKam, "Jubilees," in *Encyclopedia DSS*, 1:437.

[112] In this composition Israel's laws are rewritten, especially in cols. LI–LXVI that follow the sequence of Deuteronomy, albeit with many differences. God is mentioned in the first person. This composition is known from five Qumran manuscripts (three from cave 11, and two from cave 4), a number that is probably large enough to assume its popularity at Qumran. It is less clear whether this composition is quoted in the Qumran writings, unless the enigmatic *Sefer he-Hagu* refers to this work.

[113] E. Tov and S. A. White, "4QReworked Pentateuch^{b-e} and 4QTemple?" in *DJD* XIII, 187–351, 459–63 and plates XIII–XXXXVI.

[114] S. White Crawford, who published 4QRP together with me, recognizes the possibility that this text possibly was an authoritative Bible text, but decides against it: "The Rewritten Bible at Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible at Qumran* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; N. Richland Hills, Tx: Bibal, 2000) 173–95; eadem, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times,* forthcoming.

[115] In one instance, a fragment juxtaposing a section from Numbers and Deuteronomy (4Q364 23a–b i: Num 20:17–18; Deut 2:8–14) probably derives from the rewritten text of Deuteronomy, since a similar sequence is found in SP. In the case of juxtaposed laws on a common topic (*Sukkot*) in 4Q366 4 i (Num 29:32–30:1; Deut 16:13–14), one does not know where in 4QRP this fragment would have been positioned, in Numbers, as the fragment is presented in *DJD* XIII, or in Deuteronomy.

and in some cases more than 8 lines.[116] For a more detailed analysis of the issues involved, see elsewhere.[117]

In conclusion, our analysis focused on complete Bible books that may reflect a stage subsequent to that in MT. We believe that the Greek translations of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms), Esther, and Daniel 4–6 attest to such stages. All three books were based on Semitic texts and their underlying texts rewrote texts resembling MT. We found several characteristic features in these three compositions that are shared with rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran. These findings have implications for the LXX translations, the Qumran scrolls, and canonical conceptions.

[116] The most clear-cut examples of this technique are the expanded "Song of Miriam" in 4Q365 (4QRP^{c}), frgs. 6a, col. ii and 6c counting at least 7 lines. By the same token, the added text in 4Q158 (4QRP^{a}), frg. 14 counts at least 9 lines. 4Q365 (4QRP^{c}), frg. 23 contains at least ten lines of added text devoted to festival offerings, including the Festival of the New Oil and the Wood Festival. Further, if 4Q365a, published as "4QTemple?," is nevertheless part of 4Q365 (4QRP), that copy of 4QRP would have contained even more nonbiblical material (festivals, structure of the Temple) than was previously thought. In all these pluses 4QRP resembles 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel in the LXX.

[117] Tov, "Many Forms." M. Segal and E. Ulrich were ahead of us when claiming in 2000 that this text is Scripture: M. Segal, "4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?," in Schiffman, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 391–99; E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls: The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000) 76.

B. Greek Bible

Chapter Twenty-One

Introductory Essay to the Second Edition of the Hatch-Redpath *Concordance to the Septuagint**

In Conjunction with R. A. Kraft

A century ago, in 1897, the two volumes of the main body of the "Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint," as it was then known, were published as a set five years after the individual fascicles began to appear. The original editor, Edwin Hatch, had died in 1889; in 1906 his successor, Henry A. Redpath, completed the project by issuing a third volume that included a list of additions and errata to the main body as well as four appendices: (1) a concordance of proper names, (2) a concordance of the recently discovered Hebrew text of Ben Sira, (3) a concordance of the newly published Hexaplaric materials, and (4) a comprehensive (if awkward to use) reverse Hebrew-to-Greek index. Unmodified reprints were issued by the Akademische Druck und Verlaganstalt (Graz, Austria) in 1954 and five times by Baker Book House between 1983 and 1991.

History of Earlier Concordances of Greek Jewish Scriptures

This Oxford Concordance, or "Hatch-Redpath" (HR) as it has come to be known, was hardly a new concept or endeavor. Concordances of various sorts had been available for a long time as a backbone of study and research, primarily to assist in locating words or subjects in the main text of a standard edition, with the "dictionary" forms of the words usually arranged in alphabetic or some other accessible order (see Rouse and Rouse 1974 on early concordances to the Latin Bible; Gregory 1909 in general). It is unknown when the first concordance of the Greek Jewish Scriptures was created – a Basilian monk named Euthalius of Rhodes is credited with a handwritten concordance to the entire Greek Bible around the year 1300.[1] In the era of the printing press, however, several notable productions

* The bibliography for this chapter is located at the end of the chapter.

[1] So Sixtus Senensis, *Bibliotheca Sancta* (Cologne: Maternum Cholinum, 1566) 4.286; according to Gregory, "Concordances," this manuscript was reported to have been at Rome, "but is unknown" to him.

have fulfilled this function and sometimes more. They have also generated a significant amount of debate about how best to construct a concordance.

The first printed concordance that attempted systematically to incorporate information from the LXX/OG and associated materials was published in 1607, after seven years of preparatory work, by Conrad Kircher, a much traveled Lutheran pastor born in Augsburg.[2] Some critics (especially Trommius) called the title of Kircher's work deceptive, since the material was not arranged primarily as a "concordance to the Greek OT" with the Greek words governing the format, but alphabetically in accord with the supposed Hebrew roots. Thus, in some sense it was basically a Hebrew-Greek concordance listing under each Hebrew headword each apparent Greek equivalent along with the passages attesting it, including, occasionally, information from the Hexapla. Latin translations were included with both the Hebrew and the Greek headwords.

Critics struggled to find any consistent rationale for the exact order of the Hebrew entries (e.g., אֲבִיב, אָבַד, and several other Hebrew words stand between אֵב = "root" and אָב = "father" in the opening columns) and the order in which the Greek equivalents were presented. An alphabetically arranged index was provided to make it possible for users to locate the Greek words, but the value of this index was severely compromised by its indicating only the column numbers, to which the user then had to turn to determine what Hebrew was being represented and where. Greek words found in the Apocrypha, which had no preserved Hebrew basis and thus were not covered by the body of the concordance, were included in the index (but without Latin translation) along with the specific passages in which they occurred. As a pioneering effort, Kircher's work boldly aimed at comprehensiveness, as indicated by its lengthy title, which listed its various features and functions: organization according to Hebrew headwords; lexicons for Hebrew-Latin, Hebrew-Greek, and Greek-Hebrew equivalents; materials from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion as well as LXX/OG; Greek and Hebrew homonyms and synonyms; Greek explanation of Hebrew variations, and Hebrew of Greek; usefulness for New Testament studies as well as Old Testament. As Trommius and others would later point out, however, problems both with the organization and the details compromised the reliability of Kircher's contribution.

Several attempts to improve on Kircher's concordance are reported from the following decades of the seventeenth century. One is attributed to Henry Savile, although that identification is questioned by Redpath (1896, 72) on the grounds that it is dated to "a time when Savile had been long dead" – but at least two literary figures by that name flourished in the seventeenth century, the first and most

[2] It is probably significant that the first published New Testament concordance was also by an Augsburg native, Xystus Betuleius (Sixtus Birken) in 1546 (so Bindseil, "Über die Concordanzen," 689, 693).

famous of whom died around 1622, but the other not until 1687. In any event, Redpath calls the "Savile" compilation "a mere work of scissors and paste for the greater part. Two copies of Kircher were cut up and distributed in alphabetical order according to the Greek words, and the Hebrew equivalents were inserted either in MS or from the headings of Kircher's articles." Redpath notes that this work was preserved in the Bodleian Library at Oxford (pressmark, Auct. E.I.2,3), and that "a specimen" was edited by Jean Gagnier and printed and published in 1714 by Oxford University Press.

A similar concordance was completed in 1647 by Ambrose Aungier, chancellor of St. Patrick's Cathedral in Dublin. This was in the possession of Trinity College, Dublin, when Redpath wrote his article. Redpath did not actually see the manuscript, but on the basis of information he had received describes it (1896, 72) as "in many parts an abridged transcript of Kirchner," but following the Greek order of words, like Savile.

Le Long (1723, 1.456) also notes some other by-products from Kircher's efforts (none of which we have seen):

1. *Epitome Concordantiarum Graecarum Kircheri* produced by Arnold Bootius.

2. A two-volume work with the title *Concordantiae Graecae Veteris Testamenti Hebraicis vocibus respondentes, sive Conradi Kircheri Concordantiae inversae*. The editor is not identified (Bindseil 1870 suspects that this may be a muddled reference to Trommius). According to Le Long, this work is found in codices 3046–47 in the Bodleian Library.

3. *Concordantiae librorum Veteris Testamenti Apocryphorum Graeco-Danicae, Kircherianis perfectiores*, edited by Francisco Michaele Vogelius prior to 1699.

Perhaps the most impressive and comprehensive effort at publishing a concordance of the Greek Jewish scriptures came from the hand of Abraham van der Trommen, or Trom(m), or Trommius as he calls himself in the volume under examination. Trommius was a protestant pastor from Groningen in the Netherlands who had studied Hebrew with the younger Johann Buxtorf in Basel and had also traveled to France and England during his career. In 1692 he produced a concordance to the Bible in Flemish. In 1718, at age 84 and following sixteen years of effort, he issued his Greek concordance. He died the following year.

Trommius is understandably critical of aspects of Kircher's work and even includes in his lengthy title (typical for those times) the description "with words following the order of the Greek verbal elements, contrary to the approach taken in Kircher's work"! In his preface, Trommius takes issue with Kircher on three main points (as well as several lesser matters): (1) the failure to organize the materials alphabetically with the Greek as the basis, (2) the numerous erroneous quotations, probably caused by the manner in which Kircher worked (he first recorded where a Greek word occurred and only later filled in the actual con-

texts, and (3) the confused and confusing attempt to organize by Hebrew roots. That Trommius was not opposed in principle to some sort of lexical grouping is shown by his own juxtaposition of related Greek words (e. g., the same structural block contains ἀγαπάω, ἠγαπημένος, ἀγάπη, ἀγαπητός, etc.). But the presentation of the Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents to the Greek headwords and of the invaluable Hebrew-Greek reverse index (130 pages of detailed listings, not just page/column references) is strictly alphabetic.

In addition, Trommius discusses briefly the following procedural points:

1. For his main Greek text, he uses the 1597 Frankfurt edition of Andrew Wechel, including its occasional appended scholia and its chapter and verse divisions (as did Kircher).

2. Other editions have been consulted, such as London 1653 (with its scholia), Cambridge 1665, Amsterdam 1683, and the recent 1709 edition by Franciscus Halma and Lambert Bos (with its numerous scholia); a 33-page appendix prepared by Lambert Bos lists differences in chapter and verse locators between the Wechel text and the London edition of the Vatican text (Codex B).

3. Other ancient Greek versions and variations are also included, such as Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion (so also Kircher), while Montfaucon's Greek lexicon to the Hexapla constitutes a second appendix (70 pages).

4. A special notation is used to mark passages in which information from Greek scholia and similar older sources has been inserted because the actual LXX/OG text lacks any equivalent for the Hebrew (Greek "omissions"; Kircher also includes such material).

5. Hebrew words not represented in the Greek are not included (except as noted in § 4); for Greek words that have no Hebrew or Aramaic equivalent, an appropriate notation is also provided.

6. Transliterated Hebrew words and place names are treated variously.

7. Partial or paraphrastic renderings in the Greek present special problems for which there is no single solution.

8. Passages in which the Greek does not fully render what is in the Hebrew also present special problems.

9. Proper names are not included (so also Kircher), unless they are actually translated (not simply transliterated) by the Greek.

10. Indeclinables, prepositions and conjunctions are not included (so also Kircher).

11. Words found in the Apocrypha are included and appropriately designated (see also Kircher's Greek-Hebrew index).

12. Latin meanings for Hebrew and Greek words are included (as in Kircher; Trommius occasionally included Flemish definitions!), but basically the dictionary order of Hebrew and Greek words is followed (unlike Kircher).

Redpath's summary comparing the works of Trommius and Kircher is worth excerpting (1896, 73–74):

Trommius gives many more quotations from the Hexapla than Kircher did. He does not quote the transliterated words, and omits passages which are paraphrastic or do not give the meaning of the Hebrew. Proper names are, as a rule, omitted, and both Concordances omit indeclinable words and pronouns. The apocryphal quotations are by no means complete. A certain number of passages are given by both compilers, derived from scholia and other sources, but not actually to be found in the present text of the LXX. These are marked with a § by Trommius [and similarly identified by Kircher].

Redpath continues (p. 74), with marked understatement:

Though the book is by no means perfect, it is in some respects an advance upon Kircher. Trommius generally notices the Hebrew conjugations and also inserts conjectures as to what the Hebrew reading of the LXX was. But the work is disfigured by a considerable number of misprints and misplacements of passages in succession. This was probably due to a slip of the MS being misplaced, as we gather from these mistakes that each slip contained about six or seven lines of MS… . So far as a rough calculation can settle the point, there would seem to be four quotations in Trommius for every three in Kircher.

An interesting historical sidelight is that Jean Gagnier, who had migrated from Paris to England and received an Oxford appointment in 1717, defended the approach of Kircher over against Trommius. Already in 1718, the year that Trommius's concordance appeared, Gagnier published an essay to vindicate Kircher and criticize the work of Trommius. Doubtless this had something to do with Gagnier's plan to publish more of the "Savile" material, of which a "specimen" appeared in 1714. Redpath concludes on the basis of correspondence from that period that "many thought … that Gagnier had transgressed all the bounds of moderation in his *Vindiciae*, and the dispute about the rival merits of the two Concordances died away" (1896, 76).

In addition to Gagnier-Savile and Trommius, Le Long (1723, 1.456, with reference to Alexander Helledius, *Praesens status Ecclesiae Graecae* [1714], p. 7) mentions reports from the same general period (around 1700) that for thirty years a person named Sugdor (i. e., George Sugdures, who studied at Rome and later taught in Constantinople according to Gregory) had been working on a Greek concordance for the entire Christian Bible (Old and New Testaments), although it does not seem to have ever been published. Nor after all these years is there yet such a concordance from Western scholarship!

The existence of these basically bilingual concordances helped spur progress in lexicography and vice versa. The rather unmethodological efforts of John Williams to introduce the main Hebrew equivalents as found in Trommius into a concordance of the Greek New Testament (1767) may be noted in passing, if only because Bindseil (1870; see also Tov, *TCU*, 90–99) listed it as an addendum to his discussion of LXX/OG concordances.[3] Despite its ambiguous title, Williams's work is not a concordance of the Greek Jewish scriptures. It does, however, show

[3] Bindseil knew Williams's work only third-hand and clearly was not acquainted with its actual contents.

how lexicographical interests were served by the tools that generated Greek-Hebrew equivalents.

More promising for our purposes was the line of development laid out in Johann Christian Biel's posthumous *Novus thesaurus philologicus* that appeared in 1779–1780. This work should be discussed together with its successor, Johann Friedrich Schleusner's *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus* (1820–1821), since the two works are, in general, virtually identical in title, structure, and general content. Indeed, following his own introductory comments, Schleusner reprints the preface that E. H. Mutzenbecher contributed to Biel.

To be sure, the works of Biel and Schleusner are not concordances in the usual sense, nor do they attempt to list all biblical occurrences of each Greek headword, but they do organize the material in Greek alphabetical order, and each entry includes the Hebrew or Aramaic equivalents and sample references. Basic to these efforts is the concordance produced by Trommius. Where Biel and Schleusner make marked progress is in annotating and analyzing the presumed equivalents, including those drawn from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. They also give much more attention to identifying where the Greek translator may have had a different Hebrew text or may have read the text in what seems to us an unusual manner. Although Biel and the first edition of Schleusner do not include a Hebrew index, one was supplied (Hebrew words in alphabetic order, together with the page numbers where they occur) in Schleusner's second edition, published in Glasgow (1822) and London (1829). Even today, the materials in these antiquated volumes provide valuable information to be used alongside of our improved reprints and new tools – both print and electronic.[4] Indeed, current electronic capabilities can combine the features of lexicon and concordance features (as well as grammatical matters) into a single multipurpose tool.

What motivated Schleusner to produce his work so soon (at least from our vantage point) after the appearance of Biel's work? Doubtless there were a variety of factors, but an important event in LXX/OG study had occurred in the interim – the appearance, in stages, of Holmes and Parsons's major collation of Greek variants from the numerous available manuscripts of the LXX/OG (Oxford, 1795–1827). It was a period of renewed interest in and access to these materials, and Schleusner represents a high point of such activities. A similar proliferation of textual activity provided the context for the appearance of the Hatch-Redpath concordance, surrounded as it was by a flow of new discoveries and attendant text-critical work that remains unfinished (the "larger Cambridge Septuagint") or in progress (the Göttingen Septuagint).

One last item remains to be noticed before we reach the Oxford Concordance. The Bagster product by "G. M." (i. e., George Morrish) attempted to incorporate

[4] For some suggested refinements, see Kraft, "Towards a Lexicon of Jewish Translation Greek" (in Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography,* 157–78).

a wider range of text-critical information into its utilitarian format (1887). Redpath gives a handy thumbnail sketch of this relatively thin volume, which gives biblical chapter and verse locations but not the actual Greek (or even English) context (1896, 76):

> Pronouns and prepositions are omitted. It contains no proper names. No Hebrew equivalents are given except under θεός and κύριος, and then they are given in English characters. No references to the Apocrypha are inserted. In some of the longer and commoner words only references are given to passages where there is a various reading. The various readings are given at the foot of each article. The Appendix also contains words from the twelve Uncials of Holmes and Parsons, but "no attempt has been made to give *all* the references where a word occurs." It is impossible in any satisfactory way to compare the number of entries with that in previous Concordances. It is an extremely useful and handy book as far as it goes, but something more is still felt to be desired in the way of a complete setting forth of the Hebrew equivalents and of Hexaplaric references, and also of the Greek of the Apocrypha.

This comment brings us to the appearance of the Hatch-Redpath Oxford Concordance of a century ago.

The Hatch-Redpath Concordance

Surprisingly, the brief preface to HR (dated 1897) makes no reference at all to the history of concordance work as we have tried to lay it out here, and as Redpath himself presented it elsewhere (1896). While HR is in many ways a vast improvement over its predecessors, there are aspects that might have been even more useful if the older discussions and quibbles had been weighed more carefully, especially those between Trommius and Kircher. The most obvious failure of HR to profit from this history is in its Hebrew-Greek reverse index, which basically mimics Kircher's Greek-Hebrew index in format (criticized by Trommius and others for providing only column locations) and ignores the considerable improvement introduced by Trommius (with also a side glance to Schleusner's reverse index). The attempts to rectify this problem by various scholars in various formats are laudable: Dos Santos (1973, handwritten expansions of HR's page/column numbers) and Muraoka (handwritten manuscript privately circulated in the early 1970s, mentioned already in Dos Santos, and published in the present volume <that is, HR>) come most readily to mind, along with the "Greek Lexicon of Hebrew Words," a project still in progress (Athens, 1968–). In hindsight a reprint of the reverse index by Trommius (which includes Latin glosses and indications of the number of occurrences for each equivalence) would have served scholarship well in the intervening century!

As we have noted, HR appeared at a time of great ferment in biblical studies, with a wealth of new textual and lexicographical materials becoming available, and old perspectives and theories giving way to newer insights (see Jellicoe, *SMS*

for details). Swete's "manual edition" of the LXX/OG in three volumes – the "smaller Cambridge Septuagint" (1887–1894) – was under way, and with its focus on the "great uncials" B, A, and S provided a convenient companion to HR. Frederick Field's Oxford edition of the Hexaplaric materials had appeared in 1875, and a burst of new energy relating to these materials was inspired by the Cairo Geniza discoveries a few years later. Meanwhile, Paul de Lagarde was preparing in Göttingen his influential, if partly misdirected, reconstruction of the text of the "Lucianic" recension/revision (1883) and the larger project of which it was a part (carried forward by his pupil and successor Alfred Rahlfs).

In such a rich and productive scholarly context, HR was greatly appreciated and praised – and with good reason – although in some areas the need for even better tools was already apparent. Rudolph Smend, for example, was able to improve on the treatment of the materials from Sirach almost immediately (1907), illustrating how much of a moving target our editors faced a century ago. The new collections and collations of text-critical materials – by projects in Göttingen, Cambridge, and elsewhere – too quickly exposed the limitations of HR in terms of its value for coping with the textual richness of the LXX/OG and related traditions. Indeed, even apart from what was about to happen with the appearance of the "larger Cambridge Septuagint" and its wealth of variant readings (edited by Alan E. Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. J. Thackeray; 1906–1940), HR did not do justice to the text-critical data that had already been long available in the Holmes and Parsons edition (1795–1827) and even earlier.

For example, even Trommius included some Greek entries that were subsequently absent from HR, such as the Aldine edition's προσεκχέω in Exod 29:16 and συναλάλαγμα in Job 39:25; Codex 87's πλησιοχῶραι in Dan-Th 11:24; and the Göttingen Septuagint's ἐξανάστασις in Gen 7:4 (for which HR 82b lists only ἀνάστημα, the reading of manuscripts A and M and some other sources [manuscripts B and S are not preserved in this section]). Particularly regrettable is the absence of readings from important minuscules such as the "Lucianic" group (bo(r)c2e2) in the historical books and in Esther. Furthermore, HR does not include emendations; for example, on the basis of Jer 34:4 [= 34:5 Rahlfs = 27:5 MT] and 31:25 [Göttingen/Rahlfs = 48:25 MT], the Göttingen Septuagint – but not HR 538c – adopts ἐπίχειρα in Jer 29:11 [= 30:4 Rahlfs = 49:10 MT] instead of διὰ χεῖρα (found in all manuscripts; in all three places ἐπίχειρα represents זְרֹעַ). It is unfair, of course, to hold HR responsible for any such particulars that were not known a century ago, but its principle of neglecting variants and emendations is justifiably criticized.

The careful work by scholars like Max Margolis (1905, 1906) on the special problems presented by translation literature reminded researchers of the need for a more sophisticated approach to word groupings in Greek and Hebrew, methods pioneered already by Kircher (for Hebrew roots) and Trommius (for interrelated Greek words) and expanded by Biel and Schleusner. The failure of HR to

provide information on such word groups is well illustrated by the equivalence הוֹאַלְנוּ = κατεμείναμεν in Josh 7:7 (HR 739a), which should be examined within the larger context of comparing the word group μένω, περιμένω, ὑπομένω, and προσμένω with the word group חִיל/חוּל, הוֹחִיל, and יָחַל elsewhere in the LXX/OG. The approach advocated and to some extent pioneered by Margolis has been facilitated by the 1972 list compiled by Xavier Jacques – a valuable supplement to the mechanically alphabetic approach of HR. Jacques gathers together all the words in a single word-group that occur in the LXX/OG; for example, under the entry κλῆρος we find:

ἀκληρεῖν
ἀποκληροῦν
ἔγκληρος
ἐπικληροῦν
εὔκληρος
κατακληροδοτεῖν
κατακληρονομεῖν
κατακληροῦσθαι
κληροδοσία
κληροδοτεῖν
κληρονομεῖν
κληρονομία
κληρονόμος
κλῆρος
κληροῦν
κληρουργία
κληρουχεῖν
κληρουχία
κληρωτί
ὁλοκληρία
ὁλόκληρος
συγκατακληρονομεῖν
συγκληρονομεῖν

Jacques also indicates in which part(s) of the LXX/OG the entry-word occurs: Torah, historical books, poetic and sapiential books, prophetic books.

Especially frustrating is the approach taken in HR to the identification of Hebrew-Greek translational equivalents. In the academically conservative British environment from which HR derives, there is a focus on what Tov[5] calls "formal" equivalents – the word or words that occupy the same locations in the parallel texts – rather than on the "presumed" (conjectured) equivalents, although Trommius already had included references to presumed equivalents, added in parentheses after the formal equivalents (see, e. g., δοῦλος, κάλλος, καταδολεσχέω, καταδουλόω). But even in its low-risk setting, HR is frustratingly inconsistent – as the preface states:

> There are … many passages in which opinions may properly differ as to the identification of the Greek and the Hebrew: it must be understood in regard to such cases that the aim of the present work, from which philological discussions are necessarily excluded [see, e. g., Biel-Schleusner], is rather to give a tenable view than to pronounce a final judgment.

The preface goes on to say that the editors have resisted including conjectured Hebrew equivalents even when the "variant [Hebrew] reading followed by the Septuagint version was obvious." When it comes to coding the entries linking the Hebrew list to the individual Greek occurrences, "the absence of a reference

[5] Tov, *TCU*, 60–70.

number after a quotation implies that the passage does not exist in Hebrew [thus –] … The presence of an obelus (†) instead of a number implies that the identification of the Greek and Hebrew is doubtful" and merits closer examination.

Thus, in practice, many equivalents that could easily be described unambiguously on a formal level are nevertheless denoted "†" (or sometimes "?") because the editors suspected, with good reason, that the presumed equivalent differed from the formal equivalent. For example, συνετέλεσεν in Deut 31:1 is denoted † (HR 1319c), even though its formal equivalent is fairly obviously תָּלַךְ. Although δοῦλοι in 1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 13:3 clearly reflects עֲבָדִים instead of its formal equivalent עִבְרִים in MT, it is misleadingly denoted † (HR 246b). Likewise, καταδουλόω in Gen 47:21 reflects הֶעֱבִיד as elsewhere in the LXX/OG, but it is indicated as † (HR 731a) because the formal MT equivalent reads הֶעֱבִיר. Αἰνεῖν in Jer 38:5 [Göttingen/Rahlfs = 31:5 MT] represents הָלַל as elsewhere in the LXX/OG, but is indicated as † (HR 33c) because MT reads חָלַל. On the other hand, no such † indication is found when ἀσθενέω in Mal 3:11 is listed (HR 172a) as an equivalent of שׁכל *pi'el* (MT תְּשַׁכֵּל, though its presumed equivalent would be כשׁל *pi'el* (thus passim in the LXX/OG). Similarly, HR 1257c indicates that σαλεύω in 4 Kgdms (2 Kgs) 17:20 reflects the formal equivalent ענה *pi'el* of MT, though its presumed equivalent would be נוע *hiph'il* (thus passim in the LXX/OG). Instances could be multiplied. Such inconsistent employment of the † sign is not only misleading but also reduces the usefulness of the concordance.

An obvious example of side effects of this situation is that by eliminating reference to any formal Hebrew equivalents that may exist for Greek entries, the frequent use of the † sign in the body of the concordance makes the reverse index even less useful because it cannot include any Hebrew entries for Greek words thus marked. For example, in the reverse index the formal equivalence of צוּר and κτίστης (2 Kgdms [2 Sam] 22:32) is not mentioned because HR 796a flags this with †. Similarly, there can be no entries in the reverse index for frequently occurring Greek words (conjunctions, prepositions, numerals, pronouns) for which Hebrew equivalents are not included in HR. Nor does the reverse index mention Hebrew words when they happen to occur in combinations that are listed elsewhere in the concordance. Accordingly, the reverse index often provides incomplete information (see, e. g., אַחֲרֵי, אִם, כִּי, לִפְנֵי).

In addition, but for different reasons, the HR concordance does not list any Hebrew equivalents for words occurring in Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and other Hexaplaric sources (here also Trommius retains its usefulness; see also Biel-Schleusner). Thus HR is less useful for studying those sections of the LXX/OG traditions that represent a translation approach similar to or identical with what we identify as Aquila or Theodotion[6] or for research on individual equivalents

[6] For recent relevant discussions of this situation and of literal and free translation techniques, see Tov, *TCU,* 17–29; note also Reider and Turner 1966.

in cases where the Hexaplaric materials may provide important clues to recovering the presumed Hebrew. For example, in 1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 9:25 the proposed presumed equivalence of διέστρωσαν // רבד *qal* (where MT has דבר *pi'el*) finds support in Prov 7:16, where Aquila and Theodotion are credited with rendering רבד with περιστρώννυμι (see HR 1127a).[7] This sort of information is difficult to discover from the data in HR.

Interestingly, the notation of equivalents is different in HR's appendix 1, which lists the proper names of the LXX/OG, probably because the editors (mainly Redpath at this point) thought that the presumed equivalents of proper names could be determined more easily than those of common nouns. In some instances, equivalents in proper names are described as "aliter [otherwise] in Heb.," while in others the formal equivalents are given and yet others indicate the presumed equivalents. For example, Ἑβραῖοι in 1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 17:8 is listed by HR *53a* as an equivalent of MT's עֲבָדִים and not of the presumed עִבְרִים. But Σύρος is often represented by אֲרַם even where MT reads אֱדֹם or אֱדוֹם (HR *148b*).

As with the sign †, many question marks in HR's notation are superfluous, for the formal equivalent can be indicated easily. Several examples will suffice:

3 Kgdms (1 Kgs) 6:7 MT אֶבֶן שְׁלֵמָה מַסָּע נִבְנָה
OG λίθοις ἀκροτόμοις ἀργοῖς ᾠκοδομήθη

In this phrase, the first, second, and fourth Greek words are presented in HR with their Hebrew equivalents. The third word, however, is marked "?" (HR 153a).

Isa 23:17 [16] MT וְשָׁבָה לְאֶתְנַנָּהּ
OG ἀποκαταστ(αθ)ήσεται εἰς τὸ ἀρχαῖον

The first Greek word is given with its Hebrew equivalent, but the last receives the "?" code (HR 163a).

1 Kgdms (1 Sam) 20:30 MT בֹּחֵר אַתָּה לְבֶן-יִשַׁי
OG μέτοχος εἶ σὺ τῷ υἱῷ Ιεσσαι

Μέτοχος ("sharing in, partner"), the formal equivalent of MT's בחר ("to choose"), here reflects חבר ("to unite, join"), as in five other places in the LXX/OG. HR 918a therefore decided to add a question mark to the formal equivalence.

Likewise, in dealing with words that are transposed in the Greek translation, HR often deviates from its system of listing equivalents. In accordance with the overall layout, HR often records the inverted words in the arbitrary order of formal equivalence. For example, the inverted translation of Deut 33:8 תֻּמֶּיךָ וְאוּרֶיךָ // δήλους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀλήθειαν αὐτοῦ is recorded according to its formal equivalents (HR 53a, 295b).[8] The inverted Greek text of Deut 11:1 is treated similarly. Usually,

[7] For other examples, see Margolis 1910, 306.

[8] For a discussion of these renderings, see A. Toeg, "A Textual Note on 1 Samuel xiv 41," *VT* 19 (1969) 496.

however, HR inverts the notation with reference to the Greek words and thus records them as if they reflected a Hebrew text different from MT. Thus for Gen 30:43 שְׁפָחוֹת וְעֲבָדִים // παῖδες καὶ παιδίσκαι, the formal equivalents are abandoned in favor of the presumed (HR 1048b, 1049b).[9]

As is to be expected in a work of the scope of HR, many equations are erroneous or doubtful. A few examples may be mentioned:

1. In Gen 4:21, HR 730b incorrectly lists the equivalent of καταδεικνύναι as only תפשׂ rather than אבי כָּל-תֹּפֵשׂ (where the Greek translation condensed the three words into one).
2. In Gen 49:24, HR 751b records κατισχύειν as the equivalent of אֵבִן even though from a formal point of view the Greek verb reflects both רעה and אֵבִן.
3. Ἀθῳοῦν ("to hold guiltless") in Jer 15:15 is recorded as reflecting נקה ni. (as elsewhere in the LXX/OG), although MT reads נקם ni. ("to take vengeance").

A few remaining minor problems deserve brief notice:

- HR fails to group the evidence in the most useful manner (e. g., by juxtaposing translation units that show similar approaches or by providing references to related word groups, synonyms, or antonyms; see Jacques 1972 and Margolis 1910) and even to provide significant statistics about translational equivalents (how often does Greek *x* represent Hebrew *y* and vice versa, and in which writings? See Dos Santos 1973 and Muraoka's index [appendix 4 in HR]).
- HR provides minimal grammatical and syntactical information.
- Most transliterated common nouns are listed in the main concordance, some in appendix 1, and others in both!

Some of the problems with the reverse index noted above and elsewhere are solved in HR by Muraoka's expanded treatment.

Moving into the Future

With the advent of the computer, a new age of possibility has dawned for such tools as the textual concordance. If one has a standard computer with software for accessing reliable electronic texts, the sort of simple searches that are made possible by a traditional concordance could be performed on the fly, at least in theory. Nearly a quarter century ago, the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) project at the University of California in Irvine encoded the entire Rahlfs edition of the LXX/OG for computer access. A few years later, *BHS* was similarly encoded, and the Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint/Scriptural Study (CATSS) project created parallel Hebrew/Greek files to permit bidirectional bilingual searching of a sort that conventional concordance users could perform only with difficulty. Gradually, morphological analysis for both the Hebrew and the Greek materials

[9] See further Tov, *TCU*, 133–4.

has been added, which not only makes it possible to find all forms of particular dictionary entries in either language, but also facilitates searching for specific grammatical and syntactical features that have never been systematically noted in traditional concordances (see GRAMCORD and similar computer projects). A project to encode the textual variants in the Greek witnesses is well under way by CATSS, with the hope that a similar project on the Hebrew side will soon follow. The ability to link such data with itself and with other resources is becoming increasingly possible both on and off the Internet (see, e.g., Marquis 1991; chapter 17* above).

When Swete first issued his classic *Introduction* in 1900, he had little to say about concordances beyond mentioning that the Oxford Concordance had recently appeared and was a great asset (p. 290). Jellicoe's attempted update is only slightly more informative (*SMS,* 335–6): "Despite its being too narrowly based and other shortcomings of which the surviving editor was fully conscious [see Redpath's note prefacing the list of addenda et corrigenda] it has remained, with the supplements of 1900 and 1906… , the standard work." Jellicoe concludes (pp. 336–7) that "it would still be premature to contemplate a complete revision of the Concordance. As it stands it remains, in the hands of the discerning, a most serviceable instrument. A further supplement would be the only practicable measure, and even this should await the publication of the remainder of the relevant materials from Qumran." Probably, given the developing state of affairs and its promises for future research, no "complete revision" in Jellicoe's sense will ever be needed. But during the often-frustrating transition period, we can be comforted and assisted by having this revived HR at our sides.

Pertinent Literature (arranged alphabetically)

John R. Abercrombie, William Adler, Robert A. Kraft, and Emanuel Tov, *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS)*, vol. 1: *Ruth* (SBLSCS 20; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

Johann Christian Biel, *Novus Thesaurus Philologicus, sive Lexicon in LXX et alios Interpretes et Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (Posthumously edited by E.H. Mutzenbecher; 3 vols.; The Hague: J.A. Bouvink, 1779–1780).

Henricus Ernestus Bindseil, "Über die Concordanzen," *TSK* 43 (1870) 670–720. [An abbreviated presentation of Bindseil's more detailed treatment (not seen) in the prologue to the anthology entitled *Concordantiarum Homericarum specimen cum Prolegomenis in quibus praesertim Concordantiae biblicae recensentur earumque origo et progressus declarantur* … . (Halle: Hendelius, 1867); one of Bindseil's main sources is Le Long].

CATSS: Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint/Scriptural Studies Project, a joint project of the Hebrew University and the University of Pennsylvania, with assistance from various other institutions, under the direction of Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov. For individual volumes, see items by Abercrombie et al., Jarick, Polak and Marquis, and Tov; for further information, access the web site at URL http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/.

Elmar Camilo Dos Santos, *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem: Dugith, [1973]).

Jean Gagnier, *Vindiciae Kircherianae, sive adimadversiones in novas Abrahami Trommii concordantias graecas versionis vulgo dictae LXX interpretum…* . (Oxford: Theatro Sheldoniano, 1718) [not seen].

J. Göttsburger, "Berichtigung zur LXX Konkordanz von Hatch- Redpath." *BZ* 3 (1905) 39 [A brief note on correspondences between Isa 9:6, Job 20:15 אל = ἄγγελος, and Job 42:3 פלא ni. = μέγας, and a correction for H-P 528 col 3, Ps 139(140):8 (not 7)]; and "Zu Εἰρήνη bei Hatch-Redpath," *BZ* 4 (1906) 246 [Focusing on Isaiah].

GRAMCORD: Computerized Grammatical Concordance project from the GramCord Institute, Vancouver, Wash., under the direction of Paul Miller; initially developed for the New Testament but more recently expanded to include Jewish Scriptures in Hebrew and in Greek.

Caspar R. Gregory, "Concordances," in the New Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1908–1912). [For a similar treatment in French, see E. Mangenot, "Concordances de la Bible," in *DB* 2.C (ed. F. Vigouroux; Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1912 [1899]) 901–2; both Gregory and Mangenot are heavily indebted to Bindseil].

Robert Hanhart, "Jüdische Tradition und christliche Interpretation – zur Geschichte der Septuagintaforschung in Göttingen," in *Kerygma und Logos, Festschrift Carl Andresen* (ed. A. M. Ritter; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 280–97. [Analysis of Schleusner's lexicon].

Xavier Jacques, *List of Septuagint Words Sharing Common Elements,* published simultaneously in a French edition, *Index des mots apparentés dans la Septante: Complément des Concordances et Dictionnaires* (SubBi 1; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1972).

John Jarick, *A Comprehensive Bilingual Concordance of the Hebrew and Greek Texts of the Book of Ecclesiastes, CATSS – Basic Tools Volume 3* (SBLSCS 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).

Conrad (Konrad) Kircher, *Concordantiae Veteris Testamenti Graecae, Ebraeis Vocibus Respondentes πολύχρηστοι. simul enim et Lexicon Ebraicolatinum, Ebraicograecum, Graecoebraicum: genuinam vocabulorum significationem, ex Septuaginta duorum, ut vulgo volunt, interpretum (vel istis, pro tempore, deficientibus, ex Aquilae nonnunquam, vel Symmachi, vel Theodotionis) translatione petitam: homonymiam ac synonymiam Graecam & Ebraeam: quin & Ebraismorum variorum explanationem Graecam: Graecismorum elocutionem Ebraeam: & sic διασάφησιν Veteris & Novi Testamenti, collatione linguarum utrobique facta, suavissima συμφωνία, lectoribus exhibent.* 2 vols. (Frankfurt am Main: Claudium Marnium & heredes Iohannis Aubrii, 1607).

Robert A. Kraft (ed.), *Septuagintal Lexicography* (SBLSCS 1; Missoula, Mont.: SBL, 1972).

Jacob Le Long, *Bibliotheca Sacra in Binos Syllabos Distincta, quorum prior qui jam tertio auctior prodit, omnes sive Textus sacri sive Versionum ejusdem quavis Lingua expressarum Editiones; nec non praestantiores MSS. Codices, cum Notis historicis & criticis exhibet. Posterior vero continet omnia eorum opera quovis idiomate conscripta, qui huc usque in sacram Scripturam quidpiam ediderunt simul collecta tum ordine Auctorum alphabetico disposita; tum serie sacrorum Librorum. Huic coronidis loco subjiciuntur grammaticae et lexica linguarum, Praesertim Orientalium, quae ad illustrandas sacras paginas aliquid adjumenti conferre possunt*, 2 vols. (ed. P. N. Desmolets, with the preface by C. F. Boerner reprinted from the 1709 Leipzig edition; Paris: Montalant, 1723 [1709]).

J. Lust, "J. F. Schleusner and the Lexicon of the Septuagint," *ZAW* 102 (1990) 256–62.

Max L. Margolis, "Entwurf zu einer revidierten Ausgabe der hebräisch-aramäischen Äquivalente in der Oxforder Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament," *ZAW* 25 (1905) 311–19 [English translation: "Specimen Article for a Revised Edition of the Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents in the Oxford Concordance …," in Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*, 52–64]; see also the following related articles: "καίειν (einschliesslich der Komposita und Derivata) und seine hebräisch-aramäischen Äquivalente im Gräzismus des A. T.," *ZAW* 26 (1906) 85–90 [Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*, 65–9]; "Λαμβάνειν (Including Compounds and Derivatives) and its Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents in Old Testament Greek," *AJSL* 22 (1906) 110–19 [Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*, 70–79]; "Complete Induction for the Identification of the Vocabulary in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament with its Semitic Equivalents: Its Necessity and the Means of Obtaining it," *JAOS* 30 (1910) 301–12 [Kraft, *Septuagintal Lexicography*, 80–91].

Galen Marquis, "The CATSS-Base: Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Study for All – Transcript of a Demonstration," in Cox, *VII Congress,* 165–203 [CATSS-Base computer software for linking and searching the CATSS materials].

Raymond A. Martin et al., *The Computer Bible series* (Wooster, Ohio: Biblical Research Associates) – e. g. Raymond A. Martin, *Syntactical and Critical Concordance to the Greek Text of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah*, (The Computer Bible 12 [1977]); Martin and S. Scorza, *Syntactical Concordance to the Correlated Greek and Hebrew Texts of Ruth*: *The Septuagint Series* (The Computer Bible 30 [1988–1989]).

George Morrish, *A [Handy] Concordance of the Septuagint, Giving Various Readings from Codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, and Ephraemi with an Appendix of Words from Origen's Hexapla, etc., not Found in the Above Manuscripts* (London: Bagster, 1887; repr. 1970, 1974, 1976 [Grand Rapids: Zondervan], 1987 [Regency Reference Library]) [Title originally included "handy," but not on some later reprints].

Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Index to I Esdras* (SBLSCS 16; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1984); *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)* (Louvain: Peeters, 1993); idem, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Louvain/Paris/ Dudley, Mass.: Peeters, 2002).

Frank H. Polak and Galen Marquis, *A Classified Index of the Minuses of the Septuagint, Part I: Introduction; Part II: The Pentateuch* (CATSS Basic Tools 4, 5; Stellenbosch: Print24. com, 2002).

H. A. Redpath, "Concordances to the Old Testament in Greek," *The Expositor* 5.3 (1896) 69–77 [reviews the works of Kircher, Savile-Gagnier, Aungier, Trommius, and "G. M." = Morrish].

Joseph Reider and Nigel Turner, *An Index to Aquila* (VTSup 12; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966).

Rosenerch, "Vocabulary of the LXX" [Published as a lexicon in 1624; cited by Redpath, 1896, 77; not seen].

Ernst Friedrich Karl [Carl] Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1797) 449–55 [4-volume series, to 1800; not seen].

R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse, "The Verbal Concordance to the Scriptures," *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum* 44 (1974) 5–30 [deals almost exclusively with early concordances to the Latin Bible; note p. 5 n. 1: "The history of the Greek and the Hebrew concordances … needs more careful investigation"].

Johann Friedrich Schleusner, *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus, sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1820–1821; 2d ed. Glasgow: Duncan, 1822 and London: Duncan, 1829 [reprinted Turnhout: Brepols, 1994]).

N. Simotas, Αἱ ἀμετάφραστοι λέξεις ἐν τῷ κειμένῳ τῶν Ο' (Saloniki, 1969) [lists and analyzes the transliterated proper names and common nouns found in LXX/OG, based on HR (thus incomplete)].

Rudolf Smend, *Griechisch-syrisch-hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin: Reimer, 1907) III–XIII ("Vorrede").

Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1902; supplemented ed. by Richard Rusden Ottley, 1914; reprinted by Ktav: New York, 1968; Hendrickson: Peabody, Mass., 1989).

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae, computerized text project at the University of California in Irvine, under the direction of Theodore Brunner.

Emanuel Tov, "The Use of Concordances in the Reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX," *TCU,* 90–99.

–, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies: The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible* (CATSS 2; *JNSL*, Supplementary Series 1; Stellenbosch, 1986).

Abraham Trommius, *Concordantiae Graecae Versionis Vulgo Dictae LXX Interpretum, Cujus voces secundum ordinem elementorum sermonis Graeci digestae recensentur, contra atque in Opere Kircheriano factum fuerat. Leguntur hic praeterea Voces Graecae pro Hebraicis redditae; Ab antiquis omnibus Veteris Testamenti Interpretibus, quorum nonnisis fragmenta extant, Aquila, Symmacho, Theodotione & aliis, quorum maximam partem nuper in lucem edidit Domnus Bernardus de Montfaucon*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam/Utrecht: Sumptibus Societatis, 1718).

Chapter Twenty-Two

Approaches towards Scripture Embraced by the Ancient Greek Translators

This study focuses on the philosophy behind the approaches of ancient translators towards Hebrew/Aramaic Scripture. The background of these approaches can be researched more easily now than two generations ago, as the recently discovered Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek manuscripts from the Judean Desert provide us with new insights into individual scribes and translators from antiquity.[1] The major focus in this discussion is upon the general approaches of translators, which are usually expressed in terms of "freedom" and "literalism" in the case of translators and "carefulness" and "carelessness" when referring to scribes, while realizing that these terms are very general.

The approaches of the anonymous translators are evaluated solely on the basis of internal evidence, since they did not describe their approaches to the text.[2] At the same time, a few remarks on the difficulties of the translator in finding the right equivalences in the receptor language were made by Ben Sira's grandson in the preface to his Greek translation of his grandfather's Hebrew text,[3] and impressions of this activity are also embedded in the legendary description of the

---

[1] In addition, even the scribal approach of the *Urexemplar* of MT can be researched occasionally through its medieval representatives when these details are compared with sources from antiquity.

[2] From a different world, see Cicero's remarks on translation types when discussing his own translations of Easchines and Demosthenes (*De optimo genere oratorum* § 14). See, further, Cicero's general remarks on translation in *De finibus* § 3.15 as well as Horatius, *Ars poetica* 133. For the references, I am indebted to Brock, "Aspects" and idem, "Phenomenon." Both studies will be discussed below.

[3] 0:15–24: παρακέκλησθε οὖν μετ᾽ εὐνοίας καὶ προσοχῆς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ποιεῖσθαι καὶ συγγνώμην ἔχειν ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἂν δοκῶμεν τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν πεφιλοπονημένων τισὶν τῶν λέξεων ἀδυναμεῖν οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Εβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῇ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι. In Wright's translation (p. 637): "You are invited, therefore, to give a reading with goodwill and attention and to have forbearance for those things where we may seem to lack ability in certain phrases, despite having labored diligently in the translation. For those things originally in Hebrew do not have the same force when rendered into another language; and not only these things, but also the Law itself and the Prophets and the rest of the books are not a little different when expressed in the originals." As stressed by B. G. Wright III, "Why a Prologue? Ben Sira's Grandson and His Greek Translation," in Paul, *Emanuel,* 633–44, this introduction is exceptional insofar as the grandson felt the need to remark at all on the translation, its nature, and background.

creation of the Greek translation of the Torah in the Epistle of Aristeas.[4] Jos. *Ant*. XII 45–115 likewise describes the difficulties encountered by the translators in transferring the message of the Hebrew Bible into Greek. In a later period, Jerome described the background of his contextual translation of Hebrew Scripture into Latin.[5] One can easily be impressed by the wealth of evidence adduced as parallels to the work of the translators, but it should not be forgotten that these are mere parallels, and our only source for the study of the Greek translations is an analysis of their translation technique.

With regard to scribes, much can be learned from rabbinic prescriptions relating to the copying and transmitting of Hebrew Scripture, such as recorded in rabbinic literature.[6] These prescriptions were often adhered to in the proto-Masoretic manuscripts found at the Judean Desert sites other than Qumran (see chapter 12*). However, we should not assume that the rabbinic prescriptions were carried out exactly as they were recorded in the literature. For one thing, they only pertain to a specific group of manuscripts and scribes. Furthermore, the manuscripts from the Judean Desert preceded the date of the prescriptions in rabbinic literature by several centuries.

In a way, it is easier to analyze the approaches of ancient translators than those of scribes of Hebrew/Aramaic Scripture since we know more about the *Vorlagen* of the former than of the latter. In both cases, the texts used remain unknown but, with the aid of reconstruction procedures, the *Vorlagen* of translators are better known than those of individual scribes. In its turn, such reconstructed information can be used in the analysis of the translators' approach towards these *Vorlagen*. Thus, in the case of translations that were based on the (proto-)rabbinic text (MT), namely the Vulgate, Targumim, and Peshitta (to a lesser degree), we can allow ourselves a judgment on how these translators approached their *Vorlagen*. But even when the translation was executed from a Hebrew text other than MT, we can often express a view on the translator's approach, especially when agreements between the Greek version and a Qumran manuscript provide that extra assurance in the reconstruction of the underlying parent text of the Greek. Obviously such an evaluation leans to some degree on circular reasoning and intuition, but despite this subjectivity we can form a reasonably well-based opinion about the approach of translators when comparing their creations with the assumed *Vorlagen* even when they differed from MT. Less abstractly, 4QSam^{a} helps us in analyzing the approach of the Greek translator of Samuel, and 4QJer^{b} and 4QJer^{d} are of help in describing the system used by the Greek translator of Jeremiah.

---

[4] § 310–11.
[5] Epistle to Pammachius, 57.
[6] See *Scribal Practices*, 274–6.

The approaches of translators to their *Vorlagen* have been analyzed from the beginning of the critical investigation of the Ancient Versions (AVs). The methods of investigation have improved over the generations, but already at an early stage scholars recognized the importance of a correct understanding of the translation technique for all aspects of the analysis of the translation. The two basic approaches recognized in the translations were usually named (1) "literal," "wooden," "stereotyped," "faithful," or "careful"; and their opposites, (2) "free," "contextual," or when exceedingly free, "paraphrastic." Such characterizations referred to renderings of individual words, syntagmata, and clauses, but if a certain characterization pertained to the translation unit as a whole, that complete unit (book) was dubbed a "literal" or "free" translation. The translator of such a unit was either described as someone who tried to be "faithful" to the underlying Hebrew text or who let his imagination run freely while transferring the details of the source text into the target language. Between these two opposite approaches, many gradations and variations may be discerned, from extremely paraphrastic (to the extent that the wording of the parent text is hardly recognizable) to slavishly faithful. Thus, in the Palestinian Targumim, it is often difficult to pinpoint the exact words in the source text behind elements in the translation. But all generalizations are problematic since, with the exception of some extremely free and literal translation units, most translations fall somewhere between the two extremes. Still, even in this intervening area, most versions are closer to either the "free" or "literal" model. Although there is room for further research in this area, the theoretical background has been covered well in J. Barr's lucid analysis.[7] In our view,[8] literalness (faithfulness to the *Vorlage*) implies (1) the separate representation of all elements (sometimes down to the level of individual morphemes) of the base text, (2) adherence to the word sequence, (3) the internally consistent rendering of all words, as far as possible, with the same equivalent, and (4) an attempt to represent the words in an etymologically adequate way.[9] One may characterize free translations by features that are diametrically opposed to those ascribed to literal ones.

AVs that were not produced by single individuals – such as Jerome's Latin translation of the complete Scripture – differ much internally with regard to the translation character of the individual books. We now turn our attention to these internal differences in the LXX, specifically the question of how the different types of translation systems *within* the corpus of a certain AV relate to one another.[10] We first discuss a few general principles.

---

[7] Barr, *Literalism*.

[8] *TCU,* 17–35.

[9] Failure to follow these principles does not always imply that the translation is free. It often means that the translator lacked the adequate lexical knowledge.

[10] This question can also be phrased as referring to a possible development of translation

a. *Multiple authorship*. Unless proven otherwise, it is assumed that each translation unit in the LXX, even the individual books of the Torah, was authored by a different individual, although some clusters of translation units are recognizable.[11] Also, the individual books of the Peshitta were probably rendered by different individuals.[12] The implication of this situation is that each unit used different translation principles, and was authored at a different period.

b. *Non-sequential creation of the translations*. In the great majority of the AVs, the sequence of preparation of the individual books is not known. It would seem logical to assume that the first version to be translated in all instances was that of the Torah. But this was not true in the case of Jerome.[13] For Greek Scripture, the account of the Epistle of Aristeas describing the priority of the translation of the Torah makes a trustworthy impression, at least in this detail. Further, the post-Pentateuchal books were clearly based on the Greek version of the Torah.[14] But the present formulation of the book of Genesis is such a finished literary product that it is hard to imagine that it stood at the beginning of the translational activity.[15] Indeed, Barr expressed the opinion[16] that the translation of Isaiah preceded that of the translations of the Torah because of the lack of consistent translation approach in the Greek translation of Isaiah. As the sequence in which the books of Greek Scripture were translated is not known, the translation of Judges was not necessarily produced after that of Joshua, etc.

c. *Composite character of the canon of the "LXX."* The group of Greek Scripture texts contained in the collection of the "LXX," such as represented, for example,

---

styles. Such developments could differ from version to version, and differing types of logic may prevail within the individual AVs. See also n. 25 below.

[11] Jeremiah + Ezekiel + Minor Prophets (see Tov, *Jeremiah and Baruch,* 135–55), Jeremiah + Baruch (considered one book, see Tov, ibid.), 1 Esdras + Daniel (see Thackeray, *Grammar*, 12), Job + Proverbs (see G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*. III, *Proverbs* [LUÅ 52, 3; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1956] 59–60).

[12] See M. P. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament: An Introduction* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 56; Cambridge: University Press, 1999) 164–205; Y. Maori, "Is the Peshitta a Non-Rabbinic Jewish Translation?," *JQR* 91 (2001) 411–18, esp. 412.

[13] Jerome first embarked on the Psalter (382–6, 391), while the following books were not translated sequentially. H. F. D. Sparks, "Jerome as Biblical Scholar," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans; Cambridge: University Press, 1970) 1.510–541 (esp. 514–6) mentions the following sequence, which covers only some of the books: Chronicles, Samuel–Kings (391), Prophets, Job, Joshua–Judges–Ruth (404).

[14] See Tov, *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 183–94.

[15] See my study "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Septuagint: The Relation between Vocabulary and Translation Technique," *Tarbiz* 47 (1978) 120–38 (Heb. with Eng. summ.; German summary in *Hebräische Beiträge zur Wissenschaft des Judentums deutsch angezeigt* 1 [Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1985] 148). F. Polak, "Context Sensitive Translation and Parataxis in Biblical Narrative," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 525–39 shows how from the beginning of Genesis the translator distinguished, however hesitantly, between καί and δέ, the latter particle setting off the new unit from the preceding one.

[16] Oral communication, July 2002.

in A. Rahlfs's edition,[17] represents a heterogeneous group of texts, not only regarding their translation character, but also with regard to their date and status (private as opposed to official). Some of the books included in the "LXX" were added to the Greek corpus only at a late date, usually replacing earlier, freer renderings. This applies especially to translation units within Samuel–Kings (1–4 Kingdoms in the LXX) which contain the so-called revision of *kaige*-Th, i. e., 2 Sam 10:1 (11:1?)–1 Kings 2:11 and 1 Kings 21–2 Kings 25, included also in Ruth and Lamentations,[18] and further to the "LXX" of Ecclesiastes, ascribed to Aquila.[19]

Taking into consideration the above-mentioned constraints, we now turn to the vexing question of the different approaches to translation, which are clearly visible in the canon of Greek Scripture. For example, the translation of Joshua is often free, definitely more so than that of Judges in both the A and B texts and that of Samuel, all of which are rather faithful to their underlying Hebrew texts.[20] The translation of the Old Greek version of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms) is relatively literal,[21] and Ezra–Nehemiah and Chronicles are very literal. It is remarkable that the same types of approaches visible in the aforementioned translations of the historical books are recognizable in the versions of the Major Prophets. Thus, the versions of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Minor Prophets are rather literal, and parts of these translations may have been authored by one individual (see n. 11), while the translation of Isaiah was free and in places very free. Similar differences are

---

[17] Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*.

[18] It is possible that also other sections contained such a late revision, see Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 34 ff.

[19] See Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 21–30. It is possible that sections of individual books of the Bible were assigned to more than one translator. However, the "best" cases for the assumption of multiple authorship, i. e., Samuel–Kings and Jeremiah have now been shown to contain an alternation of original and non-original (revised) sections (see Barthélemy, *Devanciers* and Tov, *Jeremiah and Baruch*). On the composite character of the translation of the Torah, see especially J. Herrmann – F. Baumgärtel, *Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta* (BWAT 5; 1923) 53–80. On Isaiah, see J. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* (BZAW 56; 1930) 2–5; Herrmann–Baumgärtel, *Beiträge*, 20–31; J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (ATA XII, 3; 1934) 31–45; I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948) 39–42. On Ezekiel, see H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel," *JTS* 4 (1903) 398–411; idem, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (The Schweich Lectures, 1920; London: British Academy, 1921) 37–9, 118–29; Herrman–Baumgärtel, *Beiträge*, 1–19; M. Turner, *JTS* 7 (1956) 12–24; P. D. M. Turner, *The Septuagint Version of Chapters I–XXXIX of the Book of* Ezekiel, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Oxford University, 1970. On the Dodekapropheton, see Herrmann–Baumgärtel, *Beiträge*, 32–8. Other books in the LXX for which a theory of multiple authorship has been suggested are Joshua, Psalms, Baruch, and Daniel. See further the long list of bibliographical references to two- (three-)translator theories *apud* H. M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 (1975) 89–90 (n. 2).

[20] In the case of Samuel, that *Vorlage* was often identical to 4QSam[a].

[21] The freely rewritten sections in that translation were probably translated from Hebrew. See chapter 20*.

visible within the Hagiographa, where Psalms is presented in a very literal Greek version, while the translations of Job and Proverbs are very free and paraphrastic in places.

We now turn to an analysis of the *background* of these differences. This question has not occupied scholarship much, with the exception of the first explanation.

1. *The following of a translation model.* The possibility that the translators followed a specific translation model has been discussed, *pro* and *contra,* with regard to the translation of the Torah. That the translators needed such a model was axiomatic for these scholars, and all that was left for them to do was to locate this model. Accordingly, insightful studies by Bickerman, Rabin, and Brock[22] tried to identify the role model of the translators that influenced them in their decision to employ a certain approach to Scripture. Central to these three studies is the assumption, phrased differently in each of them, that at the time of the translation a dragoman, a translator, was always available when needed for the translation of commercial or legal documents. However, the validity of this assumption was rightly questioned by Wright,[23] who claimed that the model of the dragoman did not serve as a model for the translators of the Torah for the simple reason that there is no evidence supporting the existence of such an institution in pre-Roman times.[24] Accepting Wright's view, we are deprived of one parallel that could have served the translators as a model. In a way, this model could have been a valid parallel, but actually the translation of the Torah is not literal enough to have followed such a model. Brock, "Aspects" mentions a second model as well, that of the literary translations known in Egypt, but that model is not suitable

[22] Bickerman, "Septuagint"; C. Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the LXX," *Textus* 6 (1968) 1–26; Brock, "Aspects" and "Phenomenon." This view was accepted by A. van der Kooij, "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint – Who Are the Translators?," in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism, Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. Noort; VTSup 73; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1998) 214–29. Brock's often-quoted studies provide important background information on the types of translation known in Hellenistic Egypt at the time of the Greek translation, although not necessarily to the translators themselves. Beyond the evidence discussed by Brock, note also the Aramaic/Demotic equivalents of legal phrases as discussed by A. Botta, *Interrelationships between the Aramaic and Demotic Legal Traditions: An Egyptological Approach to the Withdrawal Clause in the Elephantine Aramaic Documents*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2002; B. Porten, "Aramaic-Demotic Equivalents: Who is the Borrower and Who the Lender?," in *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond* (ed. J. J. Johnston; SAOC 51; Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1992) 259–64.

[23] B. G. Wright III, "The Jewish Scriptures in Greek: The Septuagint in the Context of Ancient Translation Activity," in *Biblical Translation in Context* (ed. F. W. Knobloch; Bethesda, Md.: University of Maryland, 2002) 3–18.

[24] Brock, "Phenomenon," 17 suggests including evidence from the early Roman period "owing to the scarcity of the evidence," but precisely this point complicates the analysis.

either, since the translation is not really literary. Besides, would the translators really have known the specific translations mentioned by Brock?[25] The translators possibly had no model at all, as suggested by Wright.[26]

2. *Influence of the content of the biblical book.* Brock was the first to discuss the possible connection between the content of a biblical book (the Torah) and the translation style adopted, although he did not press for a linkage between the two.[27] When turning to this evidence, we first discuss the data analyzed in the previous paragraph, but from a different angle. In Brock's words, "since the Pentateuch was both a legal and at the same time a literary text, the initial translators were faced with a dilemma, and their hesitation is reflected in the inconsistent nature of their translation."[28] Brock thus thought in terms of a linkage between the content of the book and the translation model chosen, and in his view the translators had two different models in mind. I wonder, however, whether the inconsistency of the first translators really resulted from their doubts regarding the type of translation to be adopted. After all, the translation of the Torah is not inconsistent with regard to the translation style adopted, because if that were the case we would have witnessed many more literary renderings, at least in the poetic sections.[29] True, the translation of the Torah was far from the type of one-

[25] Writing from the point of view of a modern-day scholar, it makes sense to compare translation models, and Bickerman, Rabin, and Brock move between them with admirable ease. However, one wonders how many of these texts would have been known to the Greek translators of the Torah: Bickerman, "Septuagint," 178–80 speaks about Greek-Latin literary translations and a Phoenician inscription. Brock, "Aspects" mentions biliteral Aramaic-Greek Asoka edicts (third century BCE, Kandahar, Afghanistan) and the Greek translator of the Demotic story of Tefnut preserved in P. Lond. Inv. 274. Brock, "Phenomenon," 18 mentions Egyptian-Greek translations from a later period than that of the Torah translation. On p. 20, Brock admits that the free literary translations were "possibly only familiar at that time from oral translation."

[26] Wright, "Scriptures," 17.

[27] A similar linkage was suggested by Barr, *Literalism*, 289–90 with reference to Job and Proverbs: "Thus the fact that books like Job and Proverbs have often been noted for the 'free' style of their Greek version can *rightly* [my italics, E. T.] be connected with the fact that these books are near the edge of the biblical canon and less central to the structure of religious doctrine. But if this is true on one side, it is equally proper to note that in these books the Hebrew diction itself was often very obscure, and that some fair proportion of the freest renderings seems to coincide with very obscure phrases of the original." I wonder whether this argument can be carried through consistently for other books as well. It seems that this characterization does not apply to the contrast between the free rendering of Isaiah and the more literal one of the other prophetic books. Nor is it appropriate in the case of the free translation of Joshua in contrast to the literal rendering of Judges. Further, Qohelet, which definitely was "near the edge of the biblical canon" (thus Barr, ibid.), was represented in Greek Scripture by a very literal translation.

[28] Brock, "Aspects," 72. At this point in the analysis, Brock mentioned the different renderings of a specific Hebrew phrase in the LXX, but he did not develop further the issue of the correlation between content and type of translation.

[29] We would have expected many more contextual equivalents, additions, and omissions, as well as the employment of literary principles in the translation of poetical sections. In short, such a translation would come close to the principle of rendering according to the *sensus* of the source text (*sensus de sensu*), as described by Cicero and Jerome (see notes 2–5 above).

to-one translation presented by the later revisers such as *kaige*-Th and Aquila. However, at the time, such versions were *not* available as an alternative model,[30] since such a model did not yet exist in the beginning of the third century BCE. In short, the suggestion that the choice of translation system for the Torah was influenced by its content is not convincing.

The previous analysis pertained to the Torah only when taken as a unit. However, the relevance of content considerations in the choice of a translation model should not be ruled out completely. Thus, the nature of the Hebrew book of Leviticus is such that a more literal version than the other parts of the Torah would be needed, if the translators wished to guide the Jews of Alexandria in the implementation of the divine instructions. The translation of Leviticus is indeed somewhat more faithful to the Hebrew than the other parts of the Greek Torah, but this impression may be misleading because of its stereotyped language. In any event, the Greek translation could not provide guidance in practical matters, as the inconsistency in the choice of translation equivalents would have made practical use of that version extremely difficult.[31]

It would be hard to press the point that content considerations determined the choice of translation type for the other books. Thus, there seems to be no reason for applying a freer approach to Joshua than to the other historical books. Nor is there any explanation, it seems, as to why Isaiah was rendered rather freely, while the other prophetic books were rendered rather literally. One could argue that Isaiah was more popular, or its ideas more influential than those of the other Prophets. However, these features should or could also have influenced the creation of a literal translation that would ensure that the words of this prophet would continue to influence the Jewish people in exactly the same form as intended by the prophet. By the same token, it is understandable why the Hebrew Psalms are rendered in a literal fashion as such a type of translation would ensure the perpetuation of these songs. However, by a different logic, a free rendering of these Psalms could have enhanced their poetic beauty and hence increased their influence. The very literal renderings of other books, such as 2 Kings, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes, have yet a different background, having perhaps been produced by late revisers (see above).

Within the individual Targumim, the differences between the biblical books are not as pervasive as in the case of the LXX. Yet, some books are rather idiosyncratic; for example, the utterly paraphrastic rendering of the Targum of Canticles may have resulted from a wish to avoid a literal translation of that book, which would have proved difficult within Scripture. In another example, within the Peshitta, the character of Chronicles differs completely from that of the other

[30] Pace Brock, "Aspects," 72.

[31] This point was made by D. W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle* (TS, NS VI; Cambridge: University Press, 1959).

books (as it contained a significant layer of Jewish exegesis),[32] and it is unlikely that this feature had anything to do with the content of that book. In short, there seems to be no necessary link between the content of any Hebrew book and the character of its ancient translation.

3. *Chronological considerations.* In principle, it is not impossible that certain trends towards either literalism or freedom or even midrashic renderings developed in certain periods. One type of development would be the assumption that the faithful translation model developed *after* that of the free translation. The logic behind such an assumption would be that in the beginning translators searched for the correct system to be used in translating Scripture, and that the free translation model appealed more to the first translators than that of a literal translation. According to this assumption, the concept of faithfulness to the source at the level of words, roots, and syntagmata, such as reflected in literal translations, was created only at a later stage in the development of the translation enterprise. The concept behind such a presumed development appeals to modern logic, and it can be supported in a general sense by the collection of Greek Scripture, in which the so-called revisions appeared at a second stage of the development of that corpus. These revisions are included in the work of the independent translators *kaige*-Th, Aquila, and Symmachus, who created new, revised versions on the basis of earlier translations. However, the development could also have taken place in reverse. In such a scenario, the first translators would have espoused a rather literal school-type system of translation, to be streamlined subsequently.

While both options seem possible, there is no real evidence in favor of one of the two scenarios. It seems more likely that both models co-existed from the beginning and that translators opted for different translation systems. Thus, the model of the slightly more literal translation (Leviticus), though far less literal than the later revisions, co-existed at an early stage with the slightly freer rendering of Genesis. The very literal revisions, such as kaige-Th definitely belonged to a later stage, but the paraphrastic versions also probably derived from a later stage. At the same time, the emergence of such paraphrastic translations cannot be dated. One could claim that such paraphrastic translations as Esther and Daniel emerged at a late stage because the Hebrew/Aramaic books themselves are relatively late, but this reasoning does not apply to Proverbs. In short, we may have to conclude that chronological considerations cannot be applied profitably to the choice of translation styles in the LXX.

Students of the development of the Targumim struggle with exactly the same problems. What came first, the literal Targum Onkelos, probably Babylonian, or the later Palestinian midrashic versions? Or should a third model be devised? Alexander reconstructed a yet earlier stage, an "Old-Palestinian Targum" from

[32] See Weitzman, *Syriac Version*, 111–21 (see n. 12 above).

which both the Babylonian Targum Onkelos and the later Palestinian Targumim derived. In this way, he was able to adhere to the usual explanation of a development from free to literal versions.[33]

4. *Different Egyptian backgrounds.* If the preceding explanations do not appropriately explain the background of the differences in translation character between the various units, additional explanations must be explored. An attractive possibility for the LXX would be the assumption that the different types of translation derived from different backgrounds in Egypt. For example, literal versions may have originated in a school milieu, where the one-to-one equivalents would facilitate study of the text. This view has been defended by van der Kooij and Pietersma for the Torah as a whole.[34] Free translations could have originated in a synagogue milieu, where the audience needed to become familiarized with the meaning, rather than the exact words, of Scripture. Such free renderings would occasionally allow for contemporizing changes.[35] In practical terms, taking into consideration the translation character of the books of the LXX, this assumption would imply that, for example, the literal Greek translation of Psalms originated in an environment of learning, while the paraphrastic translations of Job and Proverbs derived from the synagogue. However, there seems to be no intrinsic reason for these three books to be split up in this way, or for Joshua to have been prepared in the synagogue and Judges in the school. Furthermore, we do not know whether such houses of learning in which Scripture was studied in a literal fashion existed in Egypt. Besides, there was a need for literal translations

[33] P.S. Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations of Hebrew Scriptures," in *Mikra,* 217–53, esp. 244.

[34] Van der Kooij, "Perspectives," esp. 226–9 (see n. 22 above). Without making a distinction between different types of translation styles, Pietersma suggested that the translation of the Torah was created in a school environment. The major argument for this assumption is the fact that, in Hellenistic Alexandria, Homer was studied in schools in which colloquial versions of that poet were created. For this purpose, Pietersma quotes from PSI 12.1276 from the first century CE. See A. Pietersma, "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in *Bible and Computer. The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique "From Alpha to Byte." University of Stellenbosch 17–21 July, 2000* (ed. J. Cook; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2002) 337–64. This specific example is impressive, to be joined by additional literary school texts from the third to sixth centuries CE. However, the relatively late date of these parallels may militate against their relevance for LXX study. More significantly, there seem to be no intrinsic elements in the translation of the Torah *as a whole* in favor of its being the product of a schoolroom environment.

[35] There is ample evidence for such contemporizing renderings in the LXX, exemplified for Isaiah by Seeligmann, *Isaiah,* 76–91 (see n. 19 above). In the case of the Targumim, according to Tal, these versions were meant to allow for modernization and exegesis, so that the Hebrew text itself could be left unaltered. In this way, the Targumim became the official companion volume to Hebrew Scripture in rabbinic Judaism, prepared for the learned, not for the masses. See A. Tal, "Is There a Raison d'Être for an Aramaic Targum in a Hebrew-Speaking Society?" *REJ* 160 (2001) 357–78.

in the synagogue also.[36] It is therefore unclear whether such a distinction between different milieus can or should be made for the LXX. In the Torah, such reasoning is further complicated by the fact that the exegesis in this version bears all the marks of Palestinian origin and scholarship,[37] thereby rendering the distinction between different Egyptian milieus less relevant. In most books of the LXX, this assumption is also complicated by the juxtaposition in single translation units of free and wooden translations.

5. *Different views about the sacred character of the books translated.* It stands to reason – although it cannot be proven – that all translators were aware of the sacred nature of the texts they were translating. Accordingly, the different translation styles should not be ascribed to different views about the degree of acceptance (authority, sacredness) of the material translated. The background of literal translations is definitely that of sacred literature. The background of free translations could imply a less strict view of the sacred character of the books rendered, but the example of the free Palestinian Targumim undermines such an assumption.

6. *Different personal approaches by translators.* Since none of the explanations of the above-mentioned differences in translation character is satisfactory, we turn to the possibility that these differences simply reflect the *personal* approaches of the translators. After all, each of the original Greek translations was the product of an individual, forming a very personal translation, as opposed to an official one. Even the translators of the five books of the Torah produced personal translations,[38] later to be accepted as official documents. The two basic approaches toward the nature of the translation, the free and the literal, probably existed from the very beginning of the translation enterprise in the minds of the translators even if they did not have specific models in mind. The translators of the Torah may have been influenced by the two above-mentioned approaches to the translation enterprise or by other conditions (see below), or they may have

[36] Even in the case of the Targumim, their exact *Sitz im Leben* is unclear. While it is usually said that these versions originated in the synagogue, and there is ample evidence that they were actively used there, it can also be shown that the Targumim were used in the *beit midrash*. See A. Shinan, *The Biblical Story as Reflected in Its Aramaic Translations* (Heb.; Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House, 1993) 20; Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations," 248 (see n. 33 above).

[37] This aspect of the description of the Epistle of Aristeas is probably trustworthy. The same translation also displays Egyptian technical terms (see n. 45 below), and therefore a way must be devised to account for both types of background. I am inclined to think that the Palestinian translators either knew Egyptian Greek, or cooperated with local experts.

[38] The use of this terminology implies that the translator reflected his views only and that, as a rule, he did not go revise his own translation on the basis of newly gained linguistic insights. Accordingly, we still find occasional transliterations of words that were not understood when the translation was made and were not corrected afterwards. By the same token, Hebrew words that were not understood initially were *not* corrected after the translator gained an understanding of them. For examples of the former, see Tov, *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 165–82; for the latter, see J. Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators," *VTSup* 16 (1967) 1–11, esp. 3.

been guided mainly by their intuition.[39] The later translators all went their own way, somehow influenced by the translation of the Torah, which is relatively literal.[40] Some translators adopted more literal translation models than that of the Torah, while others opted for free or paraphrastic renderings.

While some translators considered a literal type of translation appropriate for the divine message, others preferred a slightly or very free translation. According to some, in an abstract sense, the message of God could be more clearly presented in a free translation style. According to that approach, what matters is not the exact or consistent representation of each and every word, but the overall message of the biblical book. A translator who explained a word or part of a sentence to the best of his understanding, thought that his rendering better reflected the source than the philologically correct representation of the wording of the source language. Or, possibly, he may have thought that the target audience needed an explanation. By the same token, a translator who varied the translation vocabulary may have thought that he was reflecting the spirit of the source better than he would via a wooden and stereotyped rendering of the words.

It seems to us that the majority of the LXX translators somehow followed the lead of the translators of the Torah, who served as their models for the style and vocabulary of the translation. But which model did the first translators themselves follow? It may well be that they followed no model at all, but were simply guided by intuition and their general approach toward Scripture. "Necessity was indeed the mother of invention," Wright says ("Scriptures," 18), and I concur. But a little more was involved, and I assume – although this cannot be proven – that throughout the translation enterprise, the translators were influenced by thought patterns and models that had developed in ancient Israel. First and foremost, the translators were individuals but they were influenced additionally by their spiritual center. Possibly we should call this a model, namely that of the approach or approaches toward Scripture extant in Palestine.

The translators must have come from Palestine because such refined knowledge of the Hebrew Bible was not part of the education in Egypt (otherwise, there would have been no need for a translation). The translators brought with them knowledge of Palestinian rabbinic exegesis.[41] They were conversant with postbiblical Hebrew[42] and were influenced by the vernacular Aramaic[43] when they should have been translating according to the meaning of the Hebrew.[44] All these features, together with the kernel of the story in the Epistle of Aristeas, that

[39] At a later point in the tradition, the early translators were considered divinely inspired. See the evidence and literature quoted by Brock, "Phenomenon," 24–5.

[40] Already the Epistle of Aristeas, § 311 praised the precision of the translation.

[41] See chapter 24*, n. 12.

[42] See chapter 25*, n. 6.

[43] See chapter 25*, n. 5.

[44] The extent to which these remarks are impressionistic is shown by the fact that Brock, "Phenomenon," 34 arrives at diametrically opposed conclusions: "…I think that it can be reason-

is considered to be historical, lead us to believe that these sages from Jerusalem also brought with them their approaches. True, the LXX also reflects an Egyptian *couleur locale,* visible in certain technical terms,[45] but this is to be expected in a translation produced in Egypt (possibly reflecting the translators' knowledge, possibly reflecting cooperation with local experts). It would therefore not be far-fetched to assume that the translators brought with them from Palestine their exegetical traditions as well as their approach to Scripture in general. After all, why should we try to locate a model for the Greek translation in Egypt if the translators themselves came from Palestine? Besides, if we were not able to locate the model for the translation in Egypt, we should be able to find such a model in the Palestinian approach to the Torah.

The approach reflected in the translation of the Torah is one of precision and carefulness. The five[46] translators of the Torah may have witnessed such an approach either in translations they came across in Palestine or in copies of Hebrew Scripture circulating there. We suggest that the translators from Jerusalem brought with them this relatively strict approach towards Scripture, which guided them in transferring the message of the source language to the receptor language. Such precise Hebrew copies must have circulated in Palestine at the time of the translation (around 280 BCE); they are known to us from a slightly later period from Qumran (the proto-Masoretic manuscript 4QSam^{b} from 250–200 BCE, and to a greater extent in manuscripts from the following century).[47] The strict approach to Scripture was at the base of the precise copying, which did not allow the insertion of changes within the Masoretic tradition. However, some non-Masoretic texts were also copied carefully. The copies from which the Greek Torah was rendered could have been such precise Hebrew manuscripts. Indeed, we know of rabbinical authorities from later periods, such as Akiba (first third of the second century CE), who adhered strictly to the words of Scripture and who influenced their contemporaries. Such men must have existed also in earlier periods.

The background of the free and paraphrastic translations is more complicated. Everyone treated Scripture with great reverence, even those who copied the

---

ably assumed that Greek was their mother tongue, and Hebrew perhaps largely a language learnt at school: alongside these too it seems very likely that they knew both Aramaic and Egyptian."

[45] Cf. especially S. Morenz, "Ägyptische Spuren in der Septuaginta," *Mullus, Festschrift T. Klauser* (JbAC, Ergänzungsband I; 1964) 250–58. See further Thackeray, *Grammar*, index; Swete, *Introduction*, 21; G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, II. *Chronicles* (LUÅ NF I, 43, 3; Lund: C.W. K. Gleerup, 1946) 14–21; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 175–212 (see n. 19 above); J. Schwarz, "Notes sur l'archéologie des LXX," *REg* 8 (1951) 195–8. The evidence was collected for the first time by H. Hodius, *De bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus graecis, latina Vulgata* (Oxford: Sheldonian Theater, 1705), book II, ch. IV.

[46] Thus Hayeon Kim, *Multiple Authorship of the Septuagint Pentateuch*, unpublished Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2007.

[47] See chapter 10*.

Hebrew text with less precision. By the same token, even those who did not produce a philologically precise rendering of Scripture did so not out of disrespect, but because they felt that Scripture could also be translated by focusing on its general sense. Such freedom is less visible in the translation of the Torah, but it may be at the background of the translation of several books in the Prophets and Hagiographa. The freedom behind these renderings reflects a certain philosophical approach towards the act of translating that may be related to the nature of Hebrew Scripture scrolls. Such an approach is visible also in the Targumim.[48]

In view of this evidence, it may be safely said that the different approaches to Scripture that are visible in the Greek translations were not created in Egypt for the translation enterprise, but rather were exponents of the general approach to Scripture and Scripture scrolls in ancient Israel.[49] Everything points to the assumption that the translation was made from scrolls from Israel, and that the translators came from there as well. These translators probably brought with them the approaches toward Scripture that were current in Israel.

In summary, this study focuses on the approaches of ancient translators toward Scripture, especially those of the LXX. The discussion turned especially towards the riddle of these different approaches within the various books of the LXX and their interrelation. Although the question has not been posed in this way in previous analyses, partial answers have been given, while other possible explanations have been explored here: the following of a translation model, influence of the content of the biblical book, chronological considerations, different Egyptian milieus, and different views regarding the sacred character of the books translated. Since no satisfactory answer could be found in these explanations, we turned to a simpler one, viz., different personal approaches by translators, which had their *Sitz im Leben* in the general approaches towards Scripture in Palestine.

[48] The scribal freedom reflected in many Hebrew Qumran scrolls (see *Scribal Practices,* 261–73 and see chapter 10* above) could have encouraged that approach. These copies were full of mistakes, corrected or not, and exegetical changes. This possible influence should not be emphasized too much since the Targumim were probably translated from precise copies of MT.

[49] We find some support for our view in the study of van der Kooij, "Perspectives," 227 (see n. 22 above) who regards the Greek translators as "scribes-translators."

Chapter Twenty-Three

The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert

I. The Evidence

Leaney, "Greek Manuscripts"; L. Greenspoon, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible," in *DSS After Fifty Years*, 1:101–27; Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts."

The Greek texts found in the Judean Desert constitute merely a small part of the texts found in the area, which are best known for the Hebrew and Aramaic texts, especially the texts found at Qumran. However, the Greek texts are by no means negligible, since in several sites their number equals that of the Hebrew/Aramaic texts, and in one site they even constitute the majority. Thus, while for Qumran in general the number of the Greek texts may be negligible, for cave 7 it is not, since all 19 items found in this cave constitute Greek papyri. This cave thus witnesses activity in the Greek language, but only literary activity, since probably all the fragments found in this cave are non-documentary.

Turning now to absolute numbers of texts, a word of caution is in order. Obviously we can only refer to the numbers of the texts which have survived, but as we will turn to statistics, it should be recognized that there is no reason why Greek papyrus texts should have perished into a larger or smaller degree than the other papyri. Comparative statistics of the various texts found should therefore be considered legitimate. The majority of the texts found in the Judean Desert are Semitic, mainly Hebrew, but also Aramaic. The Qumran corpus consists of remnants of some 930 compositions that were once complete. Of these some 150 are in Aramaic (including 17 Nabatean texts), 27 in Greek, and the remainder are in Hebrew (including texts written in the cryptic scripts and in paleo-Hebrew). The Greek texts in Qumran thus comprise a very small segment of the complete corpus, namely 3%. This small percentage is matched only by the finds in Wadi Daliyeh, beyond the Judean Desert, while Greek texts have been found in much larger quantities at all other sites in the Judean Desert. Because of the fragmentary state of many texts, especially papyri, statistics for these sites can only be approximate:[1]

[1] The precarious nature of statistics may be illustrated by the following: The numerous Greek fragments from what is named XḤev/Se and which are grouped on two different plates (*DJD* XXVII, plates XLVIII and XLIX), are numbered XḤev/Se 74–169 for the sake of convenience, and likewise Ḥev/Se? 1–57 are grouped on plates L–LIII in the same volume. It is hard to know how these collections should be accounted for in a statistical analysis. The author responsible

Table 1: *Greek Texts from the Judean Desert*

Sites (North to South)	Total Number of Texts (Leather, Papyrus)	Greek Texts	Percentage of Total Texts
Wadi Daliyeh	29	0	0
Jericho	30	17+	56+
Qumran	930	27	3
Wadi Nar	4	2	50
Wadi Ghweir	2	1	50
Wadi Murabbaʿat	158	71	45
Wadi Sdeir	4	2	50
Naḥal Ḥever[2]	157+	55+	35+
Naḥal Mishmar	3	1	33
Naḥal Ṣe'elim	6	2	33
Masada	48	11+	23+

We now turn to some detailed remarks about the Greek leather and papyrus texts found in the Judean Desert, not counting ostraca. First, attention will be directed to sites other than Qumran, with the exclusion of the approximately fifty texts from Ḥirbet Mird because of their Byzantine date.

Greek texts, most of them documentary, have been found in various places in the Judean Desert (North to South): Wadi Daliyeh (1+ [undeciphered]), Jericho (17 and several fragments), Wadi Nar (2), Wadi Gweir (1), Wadi Murabbaʿat (71), Wadi Sdeir (2), Naḥal Ḥever (32 from cave 5/6; 2 from cave 8; 21, and many unidentified fragments from "XḤev/Se" and "Ḥev/Se?"),[3] Naḥal Ṣe'elim (2), Naḥal Mishmar (1), and Masada (remains of probably 11 texts [a few in either Greek or Latin] and several fragments).[4] The largest groups of Greek texts thus derive from Murabbaʿat and Naḥal Ḥever, originally wrongly denoted as "Seiyal,"[5] and involving two archives in Greek and Aramaic from Naḥal Ḥever (the archive of Salome Komaïse daughter of Levi and that of Babatha). The documentary texts found in these sites relate to such matters as marriage contracts (e. g., 5/6Ḥev 18, 37), receipts (5/6Ḥev 27; XḤev/Se 12), deeds of gift (5/6Ḥev19), registration of land (5/6Ḥev 16), summons (5/6Ḥev 23, 25, 35), letters (5/6Ḥev 52), etc. The nature of the documents found in the locations outside Qumran thus shows that Greek was

for these texts (H. Cotton) did not want to imply that these items have to be counted as respectively 96 and 57 different compositions. They should probably be counted as six different ones, although both types of accounting are imprecise. Many of the fragments in these collections will have belonged to other documents from Naḥal Ḥever published in *DJD* XXVII, while other fragments must have belonged to different texts, not published in the volume. The collections of fragments known as 1Q69 and 1Q70 are treated similarly.

[2] Including Ḥever/Seiyal.

[3] See N. Lewis, *The Documents from the Bar Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters – Greek Papyri* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Hebrew University, and the Shrine of the Book, 1989).

[4] See *DJD* XXVII, 134–5; Cotton and Geiger, *Masada II*; Tov–Pfann, *Companion Volume.*

[5] See Cotton and Yardeni, *DJD* XXVII, 1–6.

in active use among the persons who left these documents behind. That Greek was in active use beyond Qumran can also be seen from the percentage of the documentary Greek texts among the Greek texts found at the individual sites. In all sites other than Qumran this percentage is relatively high.

Table 2: *Documentary and Non-documentary Greek Texts Found in the Judean Desert*

Sites (North to South)	Total No.	Doc. Texts	Percentage of Total No.	Non-doc. Texts	Percentage of Total No.
Wadi Daliyeh	0		—		—
Jericho	17+	17+	100	0	0
Qumran	27	1	3	26	97
Wadi Nar	2	2	100	0	0
Wadi Ghweir	1	1	100	0	0
Wadi Murabbaʿat	71	66	93	5	7
Wadi Sdeir	2	2	100	0	0
Naḥal Ḥever	55+	54	98+	1	2
Naḥal Mishmar	1	1	100	0	0
Naḥal Ṣe'elim	2	2	100	0	0
Masada	11+	9+	82+	2	18

Beyond the documentary texts, a few sometimes ill-defined *literary* Greek texts have been found in various sites outside Qumran, and they are included among the statistics in Table 2: five papyri from Wadi Murabbaʿat, mostly of undetermined nature (*DJD* II, 108–12), probably two from Masada (Mas 743 [Mas woodTablet gr] from 73 or 74 CE; Mas 739 [Mas papLiterary Text? gr]),[6] and one from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXII gr), but none from the other localities of Wadi Gweir, Wadi Nar, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Mishmar, and Naḥal Ṣe'elim. The best preserved of these literary texts was found in Naḥal Ḥever, viz., the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, 8ḤevXII gr (publication: *DJD* VIII).

In striking contrast to the texts found beyond Qumran, all but one of the twenty-seven Greek texts found at Qumran are literary, although admittedly it is difficult to be certain in the case of small papyrus fragments, viz., 4Q119–122, 126–127; 7Q1–19 (all the preserved texts of cave 7 are Greek papyri); altogether there are five texts on leather and three on papyrus from cave 4, and 19 papyri from cave 7. Almost all of these texts contain Greek Scripture texts in the wide sense of the word (including 7QpapEpJer gr). This characterization includes the literary papyri 7Q4–18, which are too fragmentary for a precise identification of their contents. The one non-literary item among the Qumran Greek texts is the documentary text 4Q350 (4QAccount gr, written on the verso of frg. 9 of a Hebrew text, 4QNarrative Work and Prayer [4Q460]), the nature and date of which cannot be determined easily (*DJD* XXXVI). Likewise, the nature of

[6] See Cotton and Geiger, *Masada II,* 90.

4QpapUnidentified Fragment gr (4Q361) remains unclear (see *DJD* XXVII, plate LXI, without transcription).

The picture emerging from an analysis of the Greek texts found in the Judean Desert is that the situation at Qumran differs totally from that of the other sites. In most sites, all the Greek texts (and in Wadi Murabbaʿat and Masada, the great majority) are documentary, showing that Greek was actively used among the persons who deposited the texts. These texts include documents showing that the administration was conducted in Greek in the Roman provinces of Syria, Arabia, and Judaea, and that letters were written in that language (see, i.a., Greek letters written by Bar Kokhba's followers, found in the Cave of Letters in Naḥal Ḥever). On the other hand, there is no proof that Greek was a language in active use by the inhabitants of Qumran. It is possible that at least some of them knew Greek, since fragments of Greek Scripture were found in caves 4 and 7. However, cave 4 probably served as a depository of some kind (not a library) in which the Qumranites placed all their written texts (mainly Hebrew and Aramaic literary works, but also *tefillin* and *mezuzot*). This depository in cave 4 contained eight Greek texts, which may signify that the person(s) who brought these texts to Qumran had used them prior to their arrival, thus implying knowledge of Greek. However, it is not impossible that these texts came directly from an archive. Furthermore, the small number of Greek texts found at Qumran is also in striking contrast with the other sites in the Judean Desert. The difference is partly chronological (most of the sites in the Judean Desert are from a later period than Qumran), but more so in content: the Qumran corpus is mainly religious, which at that time would involve only Greek Scripture texts, and not other compositions.

The evidence does not suggest that the Greek texts from cave 4 were written, read or consulted at Qumran. Cave 7 is a different issue. The contents of that cave which was probably used for lodging (thus R. de Vaux, *DJD* III, 30) or as a workplace, consisted solely of Greek literary papyri, probably all Greek Scripture, and possibly all of these were brought directly to the cave from an archive outside Qumran or from a specific site within the Qumran compound. No relation between the Greek texts of caves 4 and 7 need to be assumed, and there is no reason to believe that any of these texts was found at Qumran.

Since the documentary texts found in Naḥal Ḥever, which included a Scripture scroll, show that Greek was used actively by the persons who left the texts behind, some or much use of that scroll by the persons who deposited the texts in Naḥal Ḥever may be assumed. Indeed, that Minor Prophets scroll contains a Jewish revision of the OG (see below), and as a version of this type would have suited the freedom fighters of Bar Kochba, they probably used it.

The situation was completely different for the Scripture finds at Qumran, which attest to an earlier period, up till 70 CE. In the period that is attested by the settlement at Qumran, the *kaige*-Th revision of the OG, such as reflected in 8ḤevXII gr, already existed. But neither this revision nor similar ones, found

their way to Qumran, probably not because the Qumran covenanters disagreed with the concept behind these revisions, but because they did not turn to Scripture in Greek. For them Scripture existed mainly in the source languages, and among the 220 biblical texts found at Qumran, Greek and Aramaic translations (4QtgLev, 4QtgJob, and 11QtgJob) form a small minority.

In light of this, special attention should be paid to an opisthograph, the recto of which formed frg. 9 of a Hebrew text named 4QNarrative Work and Prayer (4Q460), while the verso contained a Greek documentary text, 4QAccount gr (4Q350 [see H. Cotton, *DJD* XXXVI). It is hard to characterize that Hebrew composition, which was described by its editor, E. Larson, as "somewhat akin to the *Hodayot*."[7] Its orthography and morphology suggest that it was copied (not necessarily authored) by a sectarian scribe,[8] while the verso contains a documentary Greek text. Parallels to the Greek Account from Qumran are found in various sites in the Judean Desert: Mur 8–10A, 89–102, 118–125; 1Mish 2; 34Ṣe 5. While the evidence implies that Greek was not in active use among the Qumranites, as no documentary Greek texts have been found on the spot,[9] the Greek 4Q350 may indicate an exception, and may imply that Greek was nevertheless in use in Qumran at some stage prior to 70 CE, or that this document did not derive from Qumran.

With regard to the first possibility that Greek was in use at Qumran, and that there once was a small corpus of administrative documentary texts in Greek, attention should be directed to the documentary texts 4Q342–360 in Aramaic and Hebrew. If documentary texts were written in Qumran in Hebrew and Aramaic, they could have been written in Greek as well. However, serious doubts regarding the Qumranic origin of 4Q342–360 have been raised by A. Yardeni, *DJD* XXVII, 283–317.[10] Some of these texts may have derived from other, later, sites, and may have been sold to scholars as "Qumran" in order to enhance their price.[11]

We therefore resort to the assumption that 4Q350 was written on the verso of frg. 9 of the Hebrew text 4Q460 after the occupation of the site by the Qumranites when some of

---

[7] E. Larson, *DJD* XXXVI, 372: "It is difficult to discern the overall character of the work in its present state of preservation. The major part of the extant fragments is given over to prayer, exhortation, and admonition. It is possible, therefore, that 4Q460 is a collection of psalms somewhat akin to the *Hodayot*. This may be suggested by the paragraphing of material which is clear on frg. 9 and is supported by the fact that the material before the *vacat* is addressed to God while that occurring after the *vacat* is addressed to Israel with little or no intervening narrative to explain the change. If this understanding of the nature of the manuscript is correct, then the person speaking in the first singular in frg. 9 i 2 is some unknown psalmist."

[8] See the arguments developed in *Scribal Practices,* 261–71.

[9] The same argument cannot be used for Hebrew and Aramaic. For the Qumran community, Hebrew was *the* central language, even if they left very few documentary texts in that language (the main text showing use of this language within the community, beyond the many literary texts, is 4QRebukes Reported by the Overseer [4Q477]). No Aramaic community texts have been preserved, although the influence of the Aramaic language on the community scribes is evident in many writings.

[10] In some instances Yardeni points to joins between Qumran texts and texts that definitely derived from Naḥal Ḥever (note especially XḤev/Se papDeed F ar [= XḤev/Se 32] which forms one document together with 4Q347). Furthermore, carbon-14 examinations point to a late date of some documents.

[11] This assumption has been rejected by J. Strugnell (February 2000) who stated that the Bedouin were questioned very thoroughly regarding the origin of the texts.

the documents were still laying around, and were re-used due to the scarcity of writing material. This is suggested by the following arguments: (1) Only the verso of frg. 9 of 4Q460 was inscribed, which necessarily points to a period in which that manuscript had already been torn into pieces or had partially disintegrated. (2) The writing of a documentary text on the back of a literary text is paralleled by many Greek papyri from Hellenistic Egypt (see the analysis by Gallo),[12] by Elephantine papyri,[13] and by 4QMishmarot C (4Q324) – a documentary/literary text – which has on the verso 4QAccount C ar or heb (4Q355). Likewise, Mur papLiterary Text (Mur 112) has on its verso Mur papProceedings of Lawsuit gr (Mur 113). (3) As a rule, writing on the flesh side (the verso) of the leather (4Q350 in this case), is subsequent to that on the recto (4Q460). At the same time, it remains difficult to understand the realia of the writing on 4Q350 and 4Q460: if frg. 9 was hidden in cave 4 by the Qumran community, how could it have been re-used by those who were to occupy the site after the Qumran community?

The writing of the Greek text 4Q350 on the verso of the Hebrew text 4Q460, frg. 9 must have been later than the writing of the recto (4Q460), but the Greek writing could in principle have been performed within the period of the occupation of Qumran by the Qumran covenanters themselves, which seems to be a possible alternative. However, E. Larson argues that the Qumran sectarians would not have reused a scroll that contained the Tetragrammaton on the recto (4Q460 frg. 9 i 10) for such a profane use as recording a list of cereals in Greek (*DJD* XXXVI, 369). Larson adds: "If not, then this list could become evidence of a later occupation of the Qumran caves in the wake of the destruction of the settlement in 68 CE." If this explanation is accepted, it may imply that this text is irrelevant to our analysis of the use of Greek within the Qumran community. Cotton and Larson strengthened their position on the secondary nature of the Greek text on the verso of 4Q460 9 with additional arguments in their study "4Q460/4Q350 and Tampering with Qumran texts in Antiquity" in Paul, *Emanuel*, 113–25.

Beyond the enigmatic Greek 4Q350, the Qumran corpus bears a clearly religious character with regard to both the Hebrew/Aramaic texts and the Greek documents. Alongside the Hebrew biblical texts, the following Greek literary texts have been found, mainly containing Greek Scripture. One such text was found in Naḥal Ḥever.

1. 4QLXXLev^{a} (4Q119; Rahlfs 801)

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 161–5. Bibliography: Skehan, "Qumran Manuscripts," 157–60; P. Kahle, "The Greek Bible and the Gospels: Fragments from the Judaean Desert," *SE* 1 (TU 73; Berlin, 1959) 613–21, esp. 615–8; idem, *Cairo Geniza*, 223–6; Ulrich, "Greek Manuscripts"; Metso–Ulrich, "Leviticus."

[12] I. Gallo, *Greek and Latin Papyrology* (Classical Handbook 1; London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 1986) 10 i; M. Manfredi, "Opistografo," *Parola del Passato* 38 (1983) 44–54.

[13] See B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*, vol. 3 (Jerusalem: Akademon, 1993). Occasionally even a biblical text was re-used, as the Greek P.Leipzig 39 of Psalms (4 CE) has a list on the reverse.

Only one major fragment (frg. 1) containing Lev 26:2–16 and a small unidentified fragment (frg. 2) have been preserved of this scroll (publication: *DJD* IX). Frg. 1 represents the beginning of a sheet, as the stitching on the left has been preserved. The text is written in the *scriptio continua* with occasional spaces left between the words. There are no occurrences of the divine name in this fragment. The writing was dated by Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 223, to the end of the second century BCE, on the authority of C. H. Roberts. P. J. Parsons, *DJD* IX, 10 suggests similarly: "unlikely to be later than the first century BCE, or much earlier." Skehan, "Manuscripts," 157 dated this text to the first century CE.

This fragment probably reflects a much earlier version of the Greek translation of Leviticus than the other Greek witnesses (see § II).

2. 4QpapLXXLev^{b} (4Q120; Rahlfs 802)

Publication: Skehan, Ulrich, Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 167–80. Bibliography: see 4QLXXLev^{a}.

Several small fragments of Leviticus 1–5 have been preserved from this scroll (publication: *DJD* IX). The more substantial ones contain 2:3–5, 3:9–13, 4:6–8, 10–11, 18–19, 26–28, 5:8–10, 16–17, 5:18–6:5. There are also a large number of unidentified fragments. The writing was dated by Skehan, "Manuscripts," 148 to the first century BCE, and by C. H. Roberts to the late 1st century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE.[14] P. J. Parsons, *DJD* IX, 11 suggested likewise: "… could reasonably be assigned to the first century BCE."

This papyrus represents an early version of Greek Scripture, as shown by several unusual renderings, including the transliteration of the Tetragrammaton as Ιαω, instead of its translation as κύριος in the later Christian manuscripts of the Septuagint. 4QpapLXXLev^{b} probably reflects a version antedating the text of the main manuscript tradition of the LXX.

3. 4QLXXNum (4Q121; Rahlfs 803)

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 181–94. Bibliography: see 4QLXXLev^{a} and Skehan, "Qumran Manuscripts," 155–7; idem, "4QLXXNum: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint," *HTR* 70 (1977) 39–50; Wevers, "Early Revision."

Several fragments have been preserved of this scroll, of which the most substantial are of Num 3:40–43 and 4:5–9, 11–16 (publication: *DJD* IX). The writing was dated by Skehan, "Qumran Manuscripts," 155 to the first century BCE, and by Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 223, to the beginning of the first century CE, on the authority of C. H. Roberts. P. J. Parsons, *DJD* IX, 11 agreed to the latter dating.

---

[14] C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (The Schweich Lectures 1977; London/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979) 30, n. 1.

This scroll may reflect a version of the LXX antedating the text of the manuscript tradition of Numbers, but the evidence is not clear-cut.

4. 4QLXXDeut (4Q122; Rahlfs 819)

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 195–7. Bibliography: Ulrich, "Greek Manuscripts."

Little is known about this scroll of which only five small fragments have been preserved (publication: *DJD* IX). P. J. Parsons, *DJD* IX, 12 dated the fragments to the "… earlier second century BCE … mid second century BCE."

5. 4QUnidentified Text gr (4Q126)

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 219–21.

The nature of this text is unclear. It is dated by P. J. Parsons, *DJD* IX, 12 to the "first century BCE or possibly the early first century CE."

6. 4QpapParaExod gr (4Q127)

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 223–42. Bibliography: D. Dimant, "An Unknown Jewish Apocryphal Work?" in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells – Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (ed. D. P. Wright et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 805–14.

This text, dated by P. J. Parsons, *DJD* IX, 12 to the "first century BCE or possibly the early first century CE" was based on Greek Scripture.

7. 7QpapLXXExod (7Q1)

Publication: M. Baillet, *DJD* III, 142–3.

This text contains small fragments of Exod 28:4–6, 7. The material is too fragmentary in order to pronounce a judgment on its content or dating. In some details 7QpapLXXExod is closer to MT than the main LXX tradition, while in other instances it is further removed from it.

8. 7QpapEpJer gr (7Q2; Rahlfs 804)

Publication: M. Baillet, *DJD* III, 142.

This small fragment contains vv 43–44 of the Epistle of Jeremiah (publication: *DJD* III). Too little has survived of this scroll in order to pronounce a judgment on its nature or dating.

9. 7QpapBiblical Texts? gr (7Q3–5) and 7QpapUnclassified Texts gr (7Q6–19)

Publication: M. Baillet, *DJD* III, 142–6. Bibliography: M. V. Spottorno, "Nota sobre los papiros de la cueva 7 de Qumrân," *Estudios Clásicos* 15 (1971) 261–3; J. O'Callaghan, "?Papiros neotestamentarios en le cueva 7 de Qumran?, *Bib* 53 (1972) 91–100, translated by W. L. Holladay, *Supplement to JBL* 91 (1972) 2.1–14; idem, "Notas sobre 7Q tomadas en el Rockefeller Museum," *Bib 53* (1972) 517–33; idem, "I Tim 3, 16: 4, 1.3 en 7Q4?," *Bib* 53 (1972) 362–7; idem, "Tres probables papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrân," *StudPap* 11 (1972) 83–9; C. H. Roberts, "On Some Presumed Papyrus Fragments of the NT from Qumran," *JTS* NS 23 (1972) 446; P. Benoit, "Note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumran," *RB* 79 (1972) 321–4; idem, "Nouvelle note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumran," *RB* 80 (1973) 5–12; A. C. Urbán, "Observaciones sobre ciertos papiros de la cueva 7 de Qumran," *RevQ* 8 (1973) 233–51 (Num 14:23–24); idem, "La identificacion de 7Q4 con Num 14, 23–24 y la restauración de textos antiquos," *EstBib* 33 (1974) 219–44; J. O'Callaghan, "Sobre la identificación de 7Q4," *StudPap* 13 (1974) 45–55; idem, *Los papiros griegos de la cueva 7 de Qumrân* (BAC 353; Madrid 1974); K. Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri III," *NTS* 20 (1974) 357–581; C. P. Thiede, *Die älteste Evangelien-Handschrift? Das Markus-Fragment von Qumran und die Anfänge der schriftlichen Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1986) = *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? The Qumran Fragment 7Q5 and Its Significance for New Testament Studies* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1992); G. W. Nebe, "7Q4–Möglichkeit und Grenze einer Identifikation," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 629–33; S. R. Pickering and R. R. E. Cook, *Has a Fragment of the Gospel of Mark Been Found at Qumran?* (Papyrological and Historical Perspectives 1; The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, Sydney 1989); M. V. Spottorno, "Una nueva posible identificación de 7Q5," *Sefarad* 52 (1992) 541–3 [Zach 7:4–5]; *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (ed. S. Mayer; Eichstätter Studien 32; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1992) [this volume contains ten essays dedicated to the fragments from cave 7]; E. A. Muro, Jr., "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7 (7Q4, 7Q8, & 7Q12 = 7QEn gr = Enoch 103:3–4, 7–9)," *RevQ* 18 (1997) 307–12; É. Puech, "Sept fragments grecs de la *Lettre d'Hénoch* (1 Hén 100, 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân (= 7QHéngr)," *RevQ* 18 (1997) 313–23; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Greek Fragments of 1 Enoch from Qumran: An Unproven Identification," *RevQ* 21 (2004) 631–34.

Three of the unidentified papyri (7Q3–5) were designated by Baillet, *DJD* III as "biblical texts?," while the other ones (7Q4–19) were described as too small for identification. Among these fragments, 7Q3–5 are slightly more substantial, but they, too, are very minute. These fragments were republished by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros griegos* as fragments of books of the New Testament, while other scholars recognize in them fragments of the LXX:

7Q1 = Mark 4:28
7Q5 = Mark 6:52–53
7Q8 = James 1:23–24.

The following suggestions by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros griegos* were made more hesitantly:

7Q4 = 1 Tim 3:16–4:1,3
7Q6 = Acts 27:38

7Q7 = Mark 12:17
7Q9 = Rom 5:11–12
7Q10 = 2 Peter 1:15
7Q15 = Mark 6:48.

7Q5 has been identified also as representing the following texts:

Exod 36:10–11 (P. Garnet, *EvQ* 45 [1973] 8–9)
Num 22:38 (G. Fee, "Some Dissenting Notes on 7Q5 = Mark 6:52–53," *JBL* 92 [1973] 109–12)
2 Kgs 5:13–14 (C. H. Roberts, *JTS* 23 [1972] 446)
Matt 1:2–3 (P. Parker, *Erbe und Auftrag* 48 [1972] 467–9)

C. H. Roberts, *JTS* 23 (1972) 447 suggested the following alternative identifications from the LXX for the other texts:

7Q4 = Num 14: 23–24
7Q6.1 = Ps 34:28; Prov 7:12–13
7Q6.2 = Isa 18:2
7Q8 = Zech 8:8; Isa 1:29–30; Ps 18:14–15; Dan 2:43; Qoh 6:8

The problematic aspects of O'Callaghan's identifications are: (1) The texts are too small for a solid identification. (2) O'Callaghan had to amend the text of the New Testament in order to maintain the identification of 7Q5 with the New Testament. (3) Some of the compositions identified (Acts, 2 Peter) were written after the dates assigned to the Qumran fragments – thus Benoit, "Note." (4) In "Nouvelle note," Benoit expressed serious doubts about some of the readings, asserting that in order to make such a major claim as finding fragments of the New Testament at Qumran, more solid evidence (such as fragments with personal names) are required. (5) The papyrologists Pickering and Cook, *Fragment* read some of the key letters of 7Q5 in such a way that it cannot be identified as the text of Mark.

As a result of these doubts, Aland, "Papyri" did not include these documents in his list of New Testament papyri.[15]

G. W. Nebe, *RevQ* 13 (1988) 629–33 suggested 1 Enoch 103:3–4 for 7Q4,1 and 1 Enoch 98:11 for 7Q4,2. This suggestion was further developed by E. A. Muro and É. Puech, who suggested to identify fragments 4, 8, 11–14 with 1 Enoch 100, 103, and 105, and to name this text 7QEn gr. This identification was not accepted by Nickelsburg, "Greek Fragments."

[15] In his review of O'Callaghan's book (*JBL* 95 [1976] 459), J. Fitzmyer, S. J. summarized the evidence appropriately: "So far the evidence brought forth for the identification remains too problematic and disputed, and the fragments themselves are so small and contain so few Greek letters or words that no certainty can really be arrived at about the identification of them. And so, thus far at least the proposal is unconvincing."

In the wake of the existence in caves 4 and 7 of texts of the Greek Torah, the most likely assumption is that 7Q3–7 contain fragments of either the LXX of the Torah or Enoch.

10. 8ḤevXII gr (published as: 8ḤevXIIgr)

Publication: E. Tov with the collaboration of R. A. Kraft, *DJD* VIII. Bibliography: É. Puech, "Les fragments non identifiés de 8KhXIIgr et le manuscrit grec des Douze Petits Prophètes," *RB* 98 (1991) 161–9; idem, "Notes en marge de 8KhXIIgr," *RevQ* 98 (1991) 583–93; Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle,* 50/3, cxl–cxliv.

8ḤevXII gr contains remnants of 25 columns of a Greek Minor Prophets scroll, in two different scribal hands (Jon 1:14–Zech 9:5; publication: *DJD* VIII) reflecting an early Jewish revision of the LXX. The date of the revision cannot be determined, but the scroll itself was copied between 50 BCE and 50 CE according to the dating of its two scribal hands. The nature of the revision, belonging to the *kaige*-Th group, and reflecting distinctly Jewish hermeneutical principles, has been amply described.[16] As a Jewish revision, this text represented the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters, paralleled by other Jewish revisions.

II. Comparison of the Fragments from Qumran and Naḥal Ḥever with the Manuscript Tradition of the LXX

Data from the preliminary editions of the Greek texts from the Judean Desert (prior to the publication of *DJD* IX) were included in the critical editions of the Greek Pentateuch in the Göttingen Septuagint series,[17] while the material of 8ḤevXII gr has not been incorporated in that series, since the first edition of that volume appeared before that text was published.[18] Even though 8ḤevXII gr, as an early revision of the OG, is not part of the manuscript tradition of the LXX itself, under normal circumstances it would have been included in one of the apparatuses of the Göttingen edition.

The following analysis describes the special features of the texts from the Judean Desert (the description of 8ḤevXII gr is shorter than that of the other texts, as it has been described in detail in *DJD* VIII, 99–158). The elements which each text has in common with the manuscripts of the LXX are reviewed first. These common elements preclude the assumption that the manuscripts from the

[16] See Barthélemy, *Devanciers;* Tov, *DJD* VIII; Dogniez, *Bibliography.*

[17] J. W. Wevers, *Leviticus, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottingensis editum,* vol. II.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); idem, *Numeri, Septuaginta, etc.,* vol. III.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

[18] J. Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae, Septuaginta, etc.,* vol. XIII (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943; 2d ed.: 1967).

Judean Desert contain independent Greek versions. They are probably different forms (a revision and a more original form) of the same translation.

α. 4QLXXLev^{a} [19]

1. 4QLXXLev^{a} and the OG have a common background

The two texts share several unusual renderings, establishing their common translation tradition:

Lev 26:5 (ὁ) σπόρος = זרע MT SP (הזרע). This equivalent recurs elsewhere only 6 times in the LXX, while the usual LXX equivalent is σπέρμα.

Lev 26:5 ἄμητος = LXX$^{a,b*\ 121\ etc}$] ἀλόητος LXX (= editions of Rahlfs and Wevers) – דיש MT SP. Strictly speaking this is not a case of agreement as the reading of 4QLXXLev^{a} is found in some of the manuscripts of the LXX. ἄμητος (harvest, reaping) probably reflects the original reading, and ἀλόητος a later revision approximating to MT. Alternatively, the equivalent ἄμητος may reflect an ancient corruption common to 4QLXXLev^{a} and the tradition of LXX$^{a,b*\ 121\ etc}$ based on an early interchange of M/ΛO. In that case the reading ἀλόητος should be considered original as it reflects the general LXX vocabulary.[20] Although the equivalent ἀλόητος – דיש occurs only here in the LXX, and the word itself occurs also in Amos 9:13 (MT חורש), the verb ἀλοάω occurs elsewhere four times for דוש, so that the equivalent is well supported. The same interchange occurs also in Amos 9:13 MT חורש – ἀλόητος (LXX$^{w'\ b\text{-}239\ q*\text{-}198\ etc.}$ ἄμητος). The phrase used there (καὶ καταλήμψεται ὁ ἀλόητος τὸν τρύγητον) is identical to Lev-LXX. The first explanation is preferable, as the graphical resemblance is not convincing.[21]

Lev 26:6 καὶ ἀ]πολῶ – והשבתי MT SP. This equivalent is unique in the Torah, while it occurs elsewhere in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. The regular equivalent in the Torah is καταπαύω.

Lev 26:6 πολεμός – חרב MT SP. Elsewhere this equivalent recurs in Lev 26:36,37; Num 14:3; 20:18; Josh 10:11; Job 5:15. The main LXX equivalents are μάχαιρα and ῥομφαία (probably also occurring in v 8).

Lev 26:6 φόνῳ – לחרב MT SP. This unusual equivalent occurs elsewhere only in Exod 5:3 and Deut 28:22.

Lev 26:8 διώξονται μυριάδας – רבבה ירדפו MT SP. The two Greek texts share the reversed sequence.

Lev 26:11 βδελύξεται – תגעל MT SP. This equivalence occurs only here in the LXX. The Greek verb usually reflects תעב, while געל is more frequently rendered by προσοχθίζω (4 x; including once in v 15) and ἀποθέω (2 x).

Lev 26:13 μετὰ παρρησίας – קוממיות MT SP (קוממית). The Hebrew *hapax* word ("with head held high") is rendered by a LXX *hapax* ("openly").

---

[19] The text has been preserved very fragmentarily. As a rule, the reconstructions of Skehan and Ulrich in *DJD* IX are acceptable, but the following ones are in our view questionable: v 11 [σκηνήν] (LXX: διαθήκην; MT: משכני); v 12 [θεός] = LXX (MT לאלהים); v 15 [αὐτοῖς] = LXX (MT: בחקתי); v 15 ἀ[λλά] (not in MT).

[20] Thus Walters, *Text*, 226.

[21] Thus J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBLSCS 44; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 439 and idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 38 (2005) 1–24 (3) as opposed to his earlier text edition (see n. 17), in which ἀλόητος is adopted.

Lev 26:15 ἀλλά – ואם MT SP. The frequency of this unusual equivalent cannot be examined in the extant tools.
Lev 26:16 ψώρα – שחפת MT SP. The Hebrew recurs elsewhere only in Deut 28:27, where it is rendered by the same Greek word ("itch").
Lev 26:16 καὶ τὴν ψυ[χὴν ἐκτήκουσαν – ומדיבת נפש MT SP (ומדיבות). Even though the reconstruction is problematical, the syntax of the two Greek versions is similar or identical, as opposed to MT SP (note the sequence of the words).

2. 4QLXXLev[a] reflects the OG, while the main LXX tradition probably reflects a revision

Evidence presented in this category reveals the main characteristics of the Qumran text, pointing to its pre-revisional status.

2a. 4QLXXLev[a] represents an unusual rendering or equivalent

Lev 26:4 [τὸν ὑετὸν τ]ῇι γῇι ὑμῶν] τὸν ὑετὸν ὑμῖν LXX – גשמיכם MT SP. The deviating translation of 4QLXXLev[a] could have been influenced by the phrase occurring in the list of covenant blessings in Deut 28:12, 24 δοῦναι τὸν ὑετὸν τῇ γῇ σου – לתת מטר ארצך (the same exegesis may also be behind T[J] מיטריא דארעכון). At the same time, a variant like גשם/מטר ארצכם is not impossible. LXX reflects an approximation to MT, while ὑμῖν reflects the pronominal suffix freely.[22]

Lev 26:8 πέντε ὑμῶν] ἐξ ὑμῶν πέντε LXX – מכם חמישה MT SP.
The unusual sequence of 4QLXXLev[a], presenting a better construction in Greek, probably represents the original translation, for which cf. ומאה מכם – καὶ ἑκατὸν ὑμῶν in the immediate context. LXX reflects an approximation to MT.

Lev 26:9 [καὶ ἔσται μο]υ ἡ διαθήκη ἐν ὑμῖν[ ] καὶ στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου μεθ' ὑμῶν LXX – והקימתי את בריתי אתכם MT SP. It is unlikely that 4QLXXLev[a] reflects a variant such as והיתה בריתי בתוככם (cf. Ezek 37:26 ברית עולם יהיה אותם). Rather, it reflects the original free rendering (for which cf. Num 25:13; 1 Kgs 8:21; Mal 2:4, 5), adapted to MT in the main manuscript tradition of the LXX. Instead of the aforementioned reconstruction in *DJD* IX [καὶ ἔσται], one may also reconstruct [καὶ στήσεται], which should also be considered a free rendering. Note the Greek literary sequence μο]υ ἡ διαθήκη, for which cf. the preceding and following entries.

Lev 26:10 ἐξοίσετ]ε μετὰ τῶν νέων] ἐκ προσώπου τῶν νέων ἐξοίσετε LXX – מפני חדש תוציאו MT SP. ἐκ προσώπου of the LXX reflects a stereotyped rendering replacing the better Greek μετά of the scroll. That word reflects a more elegant Greek expression, but is probably based on a misunderstanding of the Hebrew. According to MT SP, "you shall eat the old and then clear out (replace) the old to make room for the new." According to 4QLXXLev[a], however, "you shall eat the old together with the new." Note further the

[22] This rendering of the LXX was probably influenced by the same factor influencing the addition of τῇ γῇ in 4QLXXLev[a], viz., the unusual phrase ונתתי גשמיכם, "and I [God] gave their rains." For the addition of the pronoun, cf. Jer 5:24 (K) הנתן גשם ויורה – τὸν δίδοντα ἡμῖν ὑετὸν πρόιμον and Ezek 34:26 והורדתי הגשם – καὶ δώσω τὸν ὑετὸν ὑμῖν as well as later in our chapter, Lev 26:20: ועץ הארץ – καὶ τὸ ξύλον τοῦ ἀγροῦ ὑμῶν.

sequence of the words in 4QLXXLev[a] (cf. the previous entries), which is more elegant in Greek. This sequence was corrected in the main text of the LXX to MT.

Lev 26:12 μοι ἔθν[ος] μου λαός LXX (לי לעם MT SP). This remarkable lexical discrepancy probably best characterizes the relation between the two texts. In the vocabulary of the LXX λαός usually refers to Israel (reflecting עם), while ἔθνος pertains to peoples other than Israel (also in profane Greek ἔθνη denoted "foreign nations" prior to the time of the LXX [thus LSJ]). These equivalents created the post-Septuagintal exegetical tradition (i.e. in the New Testament) that λαός refers to Israel as the chosen people, while the ἔθνη are the gentiles. 4QLXXLev[a] does not reflect this later standard vocabulary and therefore probably reflects the OG translation. Its lexical choice is paralleled by a few verses in the LXX, such as Exod 19:6, a central verse, where עם/גוי – ἔθνος refers to Israel in the phrase ממלכת כהנים וגוי קדוש (cf. also Lev 19:16) – in this case the Hebrew is גוי, and not עם as in Lev 26:12. It stands to reason that in Lev 26:12 also the original lexical choice preserved in 4QLXXLev[a] was changed in the majority tradition to accord with the vocabulary elsewhere in the LXX. In another detail, however, 4QLXXLev[a] equals the majority LXX tradition: neither text renders the *lamed* of לעם which is not needed in Greek.

Lev 26:13 τὸν ζυγὸν το[ῦ δεσμοῦ = LXX[mss]] τὸν δεσμὸν τοῦ ζυγοῦ LXX[maj. text] cf. MT SP מטֹת עלכם (SP מטות עולכם). Probably the equivalent of the earlier tradition as reflected in 4QLXXLev[a] and LXX[mss] was adapted in the majority manuscript tradition of the LXX to the regular equivalent of עֹל in the LXX, viz., ζυγός. The earlier translation does not constitute a precise representation of MT. The two translations have in common the understanding that מטֹת is a singular form, probably reflecting a reading מטֶּת. This understanding, although deviating from Ezek 34:27, may be supported by such verses as Jer 28:10, 12.

Lev 26:15 προστά]γμασι μου] κρίμασίν μου LXX, משפטי MT SP. The regular equivalent of משפט in the LXX is κρίμα, while πρόσταγμα (4QLXXLev[a]) usually reflects דבר and חק (and only 3 times משפט in Lev 18:26; 19:37; 26:46). The rendering of the LXX should be understood as a correction to the regular vocabulary of the LXX (κρίμα – משפט, πρόσταγμα – (ה)חק). The context in which מצוה, חקה, and משפט appear may have contributed to this unusual equivalent in the scroll which probably reflects the original translation. Less likely is the assumption that προστά]γμασι reflects a variant מצותי, for which cf. v 14. Wevers, *Notes*, 445 considers the reading of the scroll a "careless mistake."

2b. 4QLXXLev[a] probably reflects a Hebrew variant

Lev 26:4 τὸν ξύλινον καρ∘[ ] τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων (ἀποδώσει τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν) LXX – עץ(ו) (יתן פריו) השדה MT SP. The last word before the lacuna in 4QLXXLev[a] cannot be read easily. It is not impossible that it represents καρπ̣[όν, in which case the scroll reflects a different reading or a change in the sequence of words. 4QLXXLev[a] could reflect פרי(ה) עץ, although τοῦ καρποῦ would have been expected (for the reconstructed ועץ הפרי יתן פריו cf. Gen 1:11). The phrase ὁ ξύλινος καρπ̣[ός of 4QLXXLev[a] is frequently used in secular Greek (cf. LSJ, p. 1191) and may therefore reflect a free rendering. The ancient character of 4QLXXLev[a] is supported by the unusual equivalent: ξύλινος is used in the LXX for עץ, not only as an adjective, but also as a neuter noun (cf., e. g., Deut 28:42 πάντα τὰ ξύλινα σου (כל עצך) and 1 Macc 10:30). In any event, the main manuscripts of the LXX equal MT, with the exception of the representation of עץ in the plural.

Lev 26:11 βδελύξομαι = LXX$^{ms\ 126\ (βδελλύζωμαι)\ Arab}$] βδελύξεται ἡ ψυχή μου LXX – MT SP תגעל נפשי. The reading of the scroll (note the agreement with the main LXX tradition in the choice of the verb) may reflect an early variant אגעל, which could be original, in which case the reading of MT SP = LXX could reflect a euphemistic anti-anthropomorphic correction (for which cf. T מימרי), such as elsewhere in T. In these cases the correction adds an intermediary entity (נפש) in MT, avoiding the direct mentioning of God himself. In T *ad loc.* מימרא reflects נפש, but elsewhere it is added as an additional entity (like the addition in T of שכינתא and יקרא). Alternatively, MT SP could also represent a harmonistic change to other occurrences of this phrase in this chapter (vv 15, 43).

Lev 26:12 καὶ ἔσομ[αι]] καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός LXX – והתהלכתי בתוככם והייתי לכם לאלהים MT SP. There is no room in the lacuna in the Qumran scroll for a rendering of והתהלכתי בתוככם, and these words were probably lacking in its *Vorlage*, possibly by way of *parablepsis*. Alternatively, the scroll could reflect a different sequence of the phrases.

Lev 26:14 τὰ/ πάντα τὰ] προστάγματα μου] + ταῦτα LXX – את כל המצות האלה MT SP. The addition of ταῦτα in the LXX probably represents an approximation to MT, as האלה may have been lacking in the *Vorlage* of the scroll. At the same time, it is unclear whether the scroll reflects את כל המצות or את כל מצותי.

3. 4QLXXLev^{a} represents the Hebrew more closely than the "LXX"

Lev 26:6 καὶ πόλεμος οὐ δι̣[ελε]ύσετ[αι διὰ τῆς γῆς ὑμῶν. In 4QLXXLev^{a} this phrase occurs at the end of v 6 as in MT SP וחרב לא תעבר בארצכם, while the LXX has the phrase at the beginning of the verse. Both sequences may be defended. In a way, the phrase follows וישבתם לבטח בארצכם in a natural way in the LXX. Alternatively, also in MT SP and 4QLXXLev^{a} the phrase comes appropriately at the end of v 6 before ורדפתם את איביכם. It is not impossible that one of the two sequences may have been created by a textual mishap. Note, for example, that like the phrase under consideration, v 5 ends with בארצכם.

Lev 26:12 [καὶ πάλαια] = MT SP] καὶ πάλαια παλαιῶν LXX (נושן MT SP). In a conventional reconstruction there is no room in the scroll for παλαιῶν of the LXX, but it could have been added in the scroll above the line. The LXX may represent a doublet.

Lev 26:12 μοι ἔθν[ος] μου λαός LXX – לי לעם MT SP. לי is more precisely rendered by μοι in 4QLXXLev^{a} than by μου in the LXX.

4. Indecisive evidence

Lev 26:6 [ὁ]ἐκφόβων ὑμᾶς] ὑμᾶς ὁ ἐκφόβων LXX – ואין מחריד MT. In this phrase MT usually does not have an object, while the LXX occasionally adds one, e. g., Jer 46 (26):27 ואין מחריד – καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ παρενοχλῶν αὐτόν (thus also Zeph 3:13 and Ezek 34:28). The sequence of the words in 4QLXXLev^{a} more closely represents the usual sequence of the Hebrew (and the LXX), although MT SP *ad loc.* do not have an added אתכם. The LXX is more elegant.[23]

[23] Likewise, Greek enclitic pronouns, when reflecting Hebrew prepositions, such as לי, usually occur after the nouns, and only rarely before them. Cf. A. Wifstrand, "Die Stellung der

5. Analysis

4QLXXLev[a] and the LXX reflect the same textual tradition of the Greek Leviticus (§ 1), so that the differences between the two highlight their different backgrounds. There is ample evidence in favor of the assumption that 4QLXXLev[a] reflects an earlier text (§ 2),[24] and that the other witnesses were corrected towards MT. As elsewhere in the history of the LXX revisions, the revisional activity reflected in the majority manuscript tradition of the LXX was neither consistent nor thorough.[25] There is very little evidence for the alternative suggestion (see n. 25) that 4QLXXLev[a] reflects an early revision (§ 3).

β. *4QpapLXXLev[b]*[26]

1. 4QpapLXXLev[b] and the OG have a common background

The two texts share several unusual renderings, demonstrating their common translation tradition:

Lev 3:9 σὺν ταῖς]ψόα[ις – לעמת העצה MT SP

Lev 3:11 ὀσμ]ὴν[εὐωδίας cf. LXX ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας – לחם MT SP

Lev 4:7 παρὰ τ[ὴν] βά[σιν – אל יסוד MT SP (note the preposition)

Lev 4:7 παρὰ τὰς θύρας – (אהל מועד) פתח MT SP

Lev 4:28 ἐν] αὐτῇ] om MT and "the Three"; SP עליה = v 14 עליה (LXX: ἐν αὐτῇ). In v 23 בה in the same expression is likewise rendered by ἐν αὐτῇ.

Lev 4:28 χί]μαιρον cf. χίμαιραν LXX] + קרבנו MT SP

Lev 4:28 χίμαιρον (LXX: χίμαιραν) ἐξ αἰγῶν – שעירת עזים MT SP. The combination of these two nouns occurs elsewhere in Lev 4:29 (not in MT SP) and 5:6 (שעיר עזים).

Lev 4:28 θήλει[αν ἄμωμον – תמימה נקבה MT SP. Note the reverse sequence in the Greek texts (= SP *ad loc.* and in 4:32).

---

enklitischen Personalpronomina bei den Septuaginta," *Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1949–1950* (Lund 1950) 44–70.

[24] Thus also Metso–Ulrich, "Leviticus," 265.

[25] We thus adhere to the view of Ulrich, *DJD* IX, 163 (preceded by Skehan, "Manuscripts," 158): "Though none of these readings is accepted into the Göttingen *Leviticus,* it can be argued, on the basis not only of its antiquity but even more of its textual readings, that 4QLXXLev[a] penetrates further behind the other witnesses to provide a more authentic witness to the Old Greek translation." On the other hand, Wevers, *Notes*, esp. 438–45 suggests that 4QLXXLev[a] reflects a later text. Wevers returned to this view in "The Dead Sea Scrolls" (see n. 21) when evaluating all the Qumran Greek fragments.

[26] The analysis refers only to the preserved part of the scroll, and not to the reconstructions in *DJD* IX. These reconstructions show that it is often possible to fill in the majority text of the LXX, but sometimes these reconstructions are less plausible: 5:21 παριδὼν παρίδῃ (see below); ibid., τ[ι; 5:22 ὥστε (τοῦ is possible as well); 5:24 ἤ should possibly be inserted.

Lev 4:28 περὶ τῆ[ς ἁμαρ]τίας – חטאתו MT SP. The two Greek versions do not represent the pronoun.

Lev 5:8 τοῦ σφογ̣γ̣ύλου – ערפו MT SP. The Greek word occurs only here in the LXX – the only place in Scripture mentioning the neck of an animal.

Lev 5:9 [τὸ δὲ κατάλοιπον] τοῦ αἵματος – והנשאר בדם MT SP. Note the representation of ב- with the Greek genetive.

Lev 5:9 ἁμαρτί]ας γάρ ἐστιν – חטאת הוא MT SP (היא). Note the addition of γάρ (cf. 5:11 כי – ὅτι LXX) and the case-ending of the noun.

Lev 5:19 πλημμέλη]σιν [ἔ]ναντ[ι Ιαω – אשם לה׳ MT SP
Lev 5:23 (6:4) πλημμε]λήσηι – ואשם MT SP

Lev 5:21 (6:2) κοιν[ωνίας – בתשומת יד MT SP. The Hebrew (meaning unclear) and Greek words occur only here.

Lev 5:21 (6:2) πλημμέλη]σιν [ἔ]ναντ[ι Ιαω / κυρίου – אשם ליהוה MT SP. Note both the translation equivalent and the preposition (ἔναντι is also often used elsewhere in the LXX with verbs of sinning; for ἁμαρτάνω see i.a. Gen 39:9 and Exod 10:16).

Lev 5:23 (6:4) ἡ[νίκα ἄν – כי MT SP

In some instances the agreement in a particular equivalence, although occurring also elsewhere in the LXX of the Torah, cannot be coincidental.

Lev 2:4 ἐκ σε[μιδάλεως – סלת MT SP

Lev 2:4 ἄρτους ἀζύμο]υς – חלות מצת MT SP (מצות)

Lev 2:4 πεφυ[ραμένους – בלולת MT SP
Lev 2:5 πεφυραμ]ένης – בלולה MT SP

Lev 2:4 καὶ λά]γανα – ורקיקי MT SP

Lev 3:4 τῶν μηρίω[ν – הכסלים MT SP
Lev 3:10 τ̣[ὸ ἐπὶ τ]ῶν μηρίω[ν – אשר על הכסלים MT SP

Lev 3:5 καὶ τὸν λ]όβον – היתרת MT SP (היותרת)
Lev 3:10 καὶ τὸν λ]όβον[– ואת היתרת MT SP (היותרת)

Lev 3:9 τῆς κο]ιλία[ς – הקרב MT SP

Lev 4:6 τὸ]καταπετασ̣[μα – פרכת MT SP

Lev 4:27 ἀκουσίως – בשגגה MT SP

Lev 5:9 καὶ ῥανεῖ – והזה MT SP

Lev 5:18 ἧς ἠγ[νόησεν – אשר שגג MT SP

Lev 5:23 ἀδ̣ίκημ̣[α – העשק MT SP (העשוק). Other LXX equivalents are ἀδικία and ἄδικος.

2. 4QpapLXXLev^{b} reflects the OG, while the main LXX tradition probably reflects a revision

Lev 2:5 σεμιδάλεως πεφυραμ]ένης] LXX σεμίδαλις πεφυραμένη – בלולה סלת MT SP. The main LXX reading (nominative) probably corrected the earlier genetive.

Lev 3:4 τὸν *ἀπὸ* τοῦ ἥπα[τος] LXX τὸν *ἐπὶ* τοῦ ἥπατος – על הכבד MT SP.

Lev 3:11 ὀσμ]ὴγ[εὐωδίας] LXX ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας. (אשה ליהוה לחם) (והקטירו הכהן המזבחה) MT SP (והקטיר). The two texts reflect a different understanding of the relation between the segments in the sentence. For 4QpapLXXLev^{b} this was one continuous sentence, with לחם as the object of the verb, while for the LXX לחם started a nominal phrase. Since the LXX reflects the Masoretic accents, possibly the scroll reflected an earlier similar understanding.

Lev 3:12 I]αω] κυρίου LXX – יהוה MT SP
Lev 4:27 Ιαω] κυρίου LXX – יהוה MT SP
In this discrepancy between 4QpapLXXLev^{b} and the main Greek tradition, the most major in all the Greek Qumran scrolls, the scroll probably reflects the original text. The Qumran text transliterated the Tetragrammaton in *Greek* characters (preceded and followed by a space), a practice that is not known from other biblical manuscripts, where two alternative systems are known:[27]

1. The writing of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters, either in the paleo-Hebrew[28] or in the square Aramaic script.[29]
2. κύριος, usually without the article, especially in the nominative, and less frequently with the article.[30]

All the texts transcribing the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters reflect early revisions, in which the employment of Hebrew characters was considered a sign of authenticity, even though this practice only entered the transmission of Greek Scriptures at a second stage. A parallel phenomenon took place in several Hebrew Qumran manuscripts written in the square Aramaic script, mainly nonbiblical texts, in which the Tetragrammaton was

---

[27] For a detailed analysis, see H. Stegemann, *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ – Aufkommen und Ausbreitung des religiösen Gebrauchs von ΚΥΡΙΟΣ und seine Verwendung im Neuen Testament* (Bonn: Habilitationsschrift, 1969) 110–33, 194–228.

[28] The Aquila fragments of Kings and Psalms of the 5th–6th century CE published by F. C. Burkitt (Cambridge: University Press, 1897) and C. Taylor (Cambridge: University Press, 1900); the Psalms fragments of Symmachus of the 3rd–4th century CE published, among others, by G. Mercati, "Frammenti di Aquila o di Simmaco," *RB* NS 8 (1911) 266–72; P.Oxy. 1007 of Genesis (3rd century CE; double *yod*); P.Oxy. 3522 of Job (1st century CE); and both scribes of 8ḤevXII gr (1st century BCE).

[29] P.Fouad 266b (848) of Deuteronomy (the first scribe left spaces filled in with the Tetragrammaton by a later scribe) and the Psalms fragments of the Hexapla published by G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae* (Vatican: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1958). For a detailed analysis, see Stegemann, *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ*.

[30] Thus all the uncial manuscripts of the LXX as well as P.Oxy. 656 of Genesis (2nd century CE); P.Chester Beatty VI (Numbers-Deuteronomy). See W. W. von Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum* (Giessen: Topelmann, 1926–1929) and Stegemann, *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ*, 200–202.

written in paleo-Hebrew characters.[31] This practice, reflected in both Hebrew and Greek sources, indicates reverence for the ineffable name of God.[32]

In the reconstruction of the history of the Greek versions, the writing of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters in Greek revisional texts is a relatively late phenomenon. On the basis of the available evidence, the analysis of the original representation of the Tetragrammaton in Greek Scriptures therefore focuses on the question of whether the first translators wrote either κύριος or Ιαω. According to Pietersma, the first translators wrote κύριος, mainly without the article, considered a personal name in the Greek Torah, as "the written surrogate for the tetragram."[33] However, the internal LXX evidence offered in support of this assumption is not convincing, as all the irregularities pertaining to the anarthrous use of κύριος can also be explained as having been created by a mechanical replacement of Ιαω with κύριος by Christian scribes. On the other hand, according to Stegemann and Skehan, Ιαω reflects the earliest attested stage in the history of the LXX translation, when the name of God was represented by its transliteration, just like any other personal name in the LXX.[34] Skehan, ibid., p. 29 provided important early parallels for the use of Ιαω and similar forms representing the Tetragrammaton: Diodorus of Sicily I,29,2 (1st century BCE) records that Moses referred his laws to τὸν Ιαω ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν; likewise, in his commentary on Ps 2:2, Origen speaks about Ιαη (PG 12:1104) and Ιαω (GCS, Origenes 4:53); and two onomastica used Ιαω as an explanation of Hebrew theophoric names (for full details, see Skehan). The later magical papyri likewise invoke Ιαω. In a similar vein, Stegemann gives a long list of arguments in favor of the assumption of the priority of the transliteration.[35] This transliteration reflects an unusual pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton for which cf. the form in the Elephantine papyri (יהו).

In the absence of convincing evidence in favor of any one explanation, the view of Skehan and Stegemann seems more plausible in light of the parallels provided. This argument serves as support for the view that 4QpapLXXLev^{b} reflects the OG, and not a later revision/translation.

Lev 4:7 τῆς [καρ]π̣[ώσ]εως = העלה MT SP] LXX τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων
Lev 4:10 [τῆς καρ]πώσεως = LXX; העלה MT SP
Lev 4:18 τῶν]κ̣αρπωσ[εών = LXX; העלה MT SP
The regular LXX equivalent for עלה is ὁλοκαύτωμα (thus Lev 4:7), but in 4:10,18 the LXX of Leviticus used κάρπωσις (this equivalent occurs elsewhere also in Job 42:8). Therefore, probably also in 4:7 the OG contained κάρπωσις (thus 4QpapLXXLev^{b}), subsequently replaced in most manuscripts with the standard LXX equivalent ὁλοκαύτωμα.

---

[31] See *Scribal Practices,* 238–46.

[32] Origen recognized this feature when stating that the "most accurate exemplars" of the Greek Scripture wrote the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters (Migne, PG 12 1104 [B]).

[33] A. Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX," in Pietersma–Cox, *De Septuaginta*, 85–101 (98).

[34] Stegemann, *KYPIOΣ*, 197; P.W. Skehan, "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint," *BIOSCS* 13 (1980) 14–44.

[35] Among other things Stegemann claims that a transliteration rather than a translation or transcription in Hebrew characters is the natural representation of this proper noun. He also claims that IAΩ cannot be considered a change of an original form out of reverence to the divine name, since the use of the equivalent of יהוה in Greek does not prevent the pronunciation of God's name. The fact that this system is not encountered in later manuscripts of the Greek Bible, as opposed to the other systems, is a sign of originality rather than of secondary nature.

3. Indecisive evidence

Lev 4:4 καὶ εἰσάξ[ει] καὶ προσάξει LXX – והביא MT SP

Lev 4:27 οὐ πο[ιηθήσε]τ̣α̣[ι] ἢ οὐ ποιηθήσεται LXX – אשר לא תעשינה MT SP. Without ἤ, probably omitted by mistake in 4QpapLXXLev^{b} or its forerunner, the sentence makes little sense. The presence of this word in the main LXX tradition probably reflects the original reading, but the evidence is ambivalent.

Lev 5:21 (6:2)]εἰς τ̣[ον Ιαω] (παριδὼν παρίδῃ) τὰς (ἐντολὰς κυρίου) LXX – ומעלה מעל ביהוה MT SP. The two Greek texts differ regarding the preposition and probably also the verbs. There is no room for the added ἐντολάς of the LXX in the lacuna in 4QpapLXXLev^{b}. The papyrus probably did not read παριδὼν παρίδῃ in the lacuna, as reconstructed in *DJD* IX, 176, and not occurring in the LXX with εἰς, but rather ἀθετέω (used with this preposition as an equivalent of מעל in 1 Chron 2:7 and Ezek 39:23).

Lev 5:21 ἠδίκη]κεν] ἠδίκησεν LXX – עשק MT SP

4. Analysis

The agreements between 4QpapLXXLev^{b} and the main manuscript tradition of the LXX (§ 1) suggest that the two sources represent different branches of the same translation. There is more evidence for the assumption that 4QpapLXXLev^{b} preceded the main manuscript tradition of the LXX (§ 2) than for the reverse assumption. The evidence is not overwhelming, but the reverse claim that 4QpapLXXLev^{b} reflects a revision of the LXX can probably be made only in 5:21]εἰς τ̣[ον Ιαω. Probably the most convincing case for the ancient character of the Qumran text is the presentation of the divine name as Ιαω.

γ. *4QLXXNum*

1. 4QLXXNum and the OG have a common background

The two texts share several unusual renderings that demonstrate their common translation tradition:

Num 4:7 [καὶ τὰ σπονδεῖα ἐν οἷς σπέ]νδει – ואת קשות הנסך MT SP. This unusual rendering (the reconstruction is plausible) displays an important agreement between the LXX and 4QLXXNum. At the same time, 4QLXXNum (probably) and some manuscripts of the LXX add ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Num 4:8 καὶ ἐπιβάλουσιν ἐπ᾽]α̣ὐ̣τ̣ήν – ופרשו עליהם MT SP

In some instances the agreement in a particular equivalence, although sometimes also occurring elsewhere in the Torah, cannot be coincidental.

Num 4:5 τὸ[καταπέτ]ασμα = LXX – את פרכת MT SP

Num 4:7 τὴν τράπεζαν τὴν προ]κειμένην – שלחן הפנים MT SP. This rendering occurs elsewhere in Exod 37:10 (38:9), 39:36 (17) LXX^{b}.

Num 4:7 τὰ τ[ρ]υβλί[α – את הקערת MT SP. This equivalence occurs also in Exodus (2 x) and Numbers (5 x).

Num 4:7 τ]οὺς κυαθούς – ואת המנקית MT SP (המנקיות). This equivalence occurs elsewhere in Exodus (3 x) and Jer 52:19.

Num 4:8 ἐπ᾽]αὐτήν – עליהם MT SP.

Num 4:12 τὰ σκ[εύη τὰ λει]τ[ουρ]γικά – כלי השרת MT SP (השרת). This equivalence recurs only in 2 Chr 24:14.

Num 4:16 καὶ τὸ θυμίαμα τῆς συνθέ]σεως – קטרת הסמים MT SP.

2. 4QLXXNum reflects an earlier text

Num 3:40 ἀρίθμησον] ἐπισκέψαι LXX – פקד MT SP. ἐπισκέπτομαι is the standard equivalent of פקד in the main manuscript tradition of the LXX of all the books, in which ἀριθμέω is the main equivalent of מנה. 4QLXXNum inconsistently used for פקד both ἀριθμέω in 3:40 and ἐπισκέπτομαι in 3:42.[36] The evidence suggests that 4QLXXNum reflects an earlier stage of the transmission of the translation when the equivalents of פקד had not yet been standardized. The possibility of a change in the reverse direction, suggested by Wevers, "Early Revision," 238* [37] is less likely. Note that the two verbs are used in the same context in a description of the census in 2 Samuel 24 (ἀριθμέω v 1 [מנה]; ἐπισκέπτομαι vv 2, 4 [פקד]), a situation which underlines their parallellism.

Num 4:6 [ἀ]ρτῆρας] ἀναφορεῖς LXX; בדיו MT SP
Num 4:8 ἀρτῆρας] ἀναφορεῖς LXX; בדיו MT SP
Num 4:11 ἀρτῆ[ρας] ἀναφορεῖς LXX; בדיו MT SP
Num 4:12 ἀρτῆρος] ἀναφορεῖς LXX; המוט MT SP
One of the two renderings systematically replaced the other, but it is hard to determine the direction of the substitution. Possibly ἀρτήρ in 4QLXXNum constitutes the original reading (it occurs in the LXX only in Neh 4:11 for סבל) and ἀναφορεῦς the correction. This assumption is supported by the fact that ἀναφορεῦς occurs in the early Greek revisions for בד in Exod 30:4 (Th) and 39:35 (οἱ λ') and for מוט in Num 13:23 (Aq Th). This is also the regular LXX equivalent in Exodus 25, 27, 35, Numbers 4, and 2 Chronicles 5 for בד. The reverse assumption that ἀναφορεῦς is the original rendering and ἀρτήρ the correction was suggested by Skehan, "4QNumLXX," 46, and Wevers, "Early Revision," 236*–7*. According to Wevers, the early reviser conceived of ἀναφορεῦς of the LXX as an agent noun, i. e. a "carrier" rather than "an instrument for carrying," and he therefore replaced that word. However, this type of revision is evidenced less in the revisions of the LXX which usually aim at etymological clarity vis-à-vis the Hebrew and not vis-à-vis the Greek.

Num 4:12 καὶ θήσουσιν] καὶ ἐμβαλοῦσιν LXX; ונתנו MT SP
The equivalent of the LXX for נתן recurs in vv 10, 14, as well as elsewhere in the LXX (10 x) but not elsewhere in the LXX of Numbers (note further elsewhere in the LXX διεμβάλλω [1 x]; ἐκβάλλω [1 x]; ἐπιβάλλω [2 x]). The unusual equivalent of 4QLXXNum may point to

[36] In codex A ἀριθμέω occurs nine times in Numbers 2 as well as in Num 3:15, 16 for פקד where the other codices have ἐπισκέπτομαι. For exact details, see Wevers, "Early Revision," 237*–8*. This equivalent also occurs in all manuscripts of 1 Chr 21:6; 2 Chr 17:14; 25:5; 26:11.

[37] "It is a variant clarifying a Hebraic kind of Greek by a more idiomatic text." Wevers' text edition of the LXX accordingly included ἐπισκέπτομαι.

its original character, especially since it occurs elsewhere in the LXX of the Torah (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus); the compositum ἐπιθήσουσιν occurs also in v 10 (MT SP ונתנו).

3. 4QLXXNum is closer to MT SP

3a. Translation equivalents

Num 3:43 πᾶν πρωτό]τοκο[ν ἄρσεν – כל בכור זכר MT SP] πάντα τὰ πρωτότοκα τὰ ἀρσενικά LXX (the singular form of this noun is found also in the first part of this verse).

Num 4:7 ἐπ᾽α]ὐτήν – עליו MT SP] tr LXX

3b. Possibly different Vorlage

Num 4:14 SP = LXX add a large plus καὶ λήμψονται … ἐπὶ ἀναφορεῖς lacking in MT SP 4QLXXNum.

Num 4:9 [τὴν λυχνίαν τῆ]ς φαύσεως cf. τοῦ φωτος LXX^{b}] τὴν λυχνίαν τὴν φωτίζουσαν LXX (possibly reflecting an etymologizing rendering המאיר); MT SP: מנרת המאור (מנורת SP). The rendering מאור – φαῦσις occurs elsewhere in Gen 1:14–15; Ps 73(74):16; Exod 35:8 Sym; Lev 24:1 *alius*.

4. Inconclusive evidence

Num 4:7 ὑ[α]κίνθι[νον] ὁλοπόρφυρον LXX; תכלת MT SP
The equivalent used by 4QLXXNum, ὑακίνθινος = ὑάκινθος (dark blue) usually renders תכלת, while ὁλοπόρφυρος (dark red or purple) of the LXX renders once ארגמן (Lev 4:13).[38] Its main component, πορφύρα, renders ארגמן passim in the LXX. It is unclear whether 4QLXXNum reflects an imprecise translation of תכלת or a variant ארגמן (cf. בגד ארגמן 4:13; Judg 8:26). The combination כליל ארגמן (= ὁλο-πόρφυρον ?) is not known from elsewhere.

Num 4:14 τὰ σπ[ονδεῖα] τὸν καλυπτῆρα LXX; המזרקת MT SP (המזרקות). καλυπτῆρα (covering) is an inappropriate equivalent, while σπονδεῖα (cups) could reflect MT SP.[39]

Analysis
4QLXXNum has much in common with the majority LXX tradition (§ 1), suggesting that the two entities are branches of the same translation. At the same time, the evidence is inconclusive regarding the status of the Qumran text. Some of its equivalents give the impression of not having been adapted to the majority tradition of the LXX, in which case the scroll probably reflects the OG translation (§ 2). But in a few other details 4QLXXNum reflects MT more closely. Skehan, "4QLXXNum" and Wevers, "Early Revision," support the view that in these details the scroll reflects an early revision towards MT, described as a "pre-Christian

[38] This rendering may be influenced by the phrase ὅλον ὑακίνθινον in Num 4:6 where it renders כליל תכלת.

[39] Wevers, "Early Revision," 236 suggests a different reconstruction for the scroll.

reworking" by Skehan. However, the evidence in favor of the first assumption seems to be stronger (thus Ulrich, *DJD* IX, 189).

δ. *8ḤevXII gr*

When discussing the nature of 8ḤevXII gr, we are on much safer ground than in the analysis of the Qumran texts, since this scroll undoubtedly contains a revision of the OG. This text shares idiosyncratic elements with the main tradition of the LXX, so that it should be considered an integral part of that tradition (see *DJD* VIII, 104–6). 8ḤevXII gr thus does not represent an independent translation of the LXX, or a translation that occasionally consulted the main LXX tradition. Beyond this common background, there is overwhelming evidence that this scroll reflects a revision of the OG (probably part of the *kaige*-Th group), made at an early period, before the middle of the first century BCE (when the manuscript was copied). The evidence in favor of the revisional nature of this scroll was presented in detail in *DJD* VIII, 131–42. The revisional categories may be summarized as follows:[40]

1. The reviser attempted to express every element of the Hebrew with a separate Greek element, involving the addition and omission of elements vis-à-vis the OG. E. g.,

Hab 1:15 ויגיל – καὶ χαρήσεται *ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ* LXX
καὶ χαρεῖται 8ḤevXII gr
Hab 1:17 העל כן – διὰ τοῦτο LXX
εἰ διὰ τοῦτο 8ḤevXII gr

2. The reviser represented each word with an etymologically precise rendering, even if the free rendering of the OG was more elegant or contextually more appropriate. E. g.,

Hab 1:8 וקלו – καὶ ἐξαλούνται LXX
καὶ κουφ[ότεροι 8ḤevXII gr
Hab 2:1 ואתיצבה – καὶ ἐπιβήσομαι LXX
καὶ στηλώσομαι 8ḤevXII gr.

The correction is based on the equivalent מצבה – στήλη also found elsewhere in the *kaige*-Th revision.

3. The reviser adhered to a single equivalent for each Hebrew word or word-group. E. g.,

Hab 1:10 וילכדה – καὶ κρατήσει αὐτοῦ LXX
καὶ συνλήψε[ται αὐτό 8ḤevXII gr

[40] In this analysis, not all differences between the LXX and the scroll are accounted for. Some corrections of the scroll are based on Hebrew readings differing from MT, either in consonants or their reading (vocalization).

The correction was based on a distinction between the equivalences חזק – κρατ- and לכד – συλλαμβάνω *passim* in the LXX.

Hab 2:3 יתמהמה – ὑστερήσῃ LXX
στραγ[γεύσηται 8ḤevXII gr

The correction was based on the understanding that ὑστερ- was reserved to the root אחר (cf. ὕστερος, -ον – אחר(ו)ן passim).

4. The reviser adhered to a system of formal equivalences between grammatical categories: a plural form in MT should be represented by a plural form in the translation, adverbs should be represented by adverbs, verbs by verbs, and so forth. E. g.,

Hab 1:9 לחמס – εἰς ἀσεβεῖς LXX
εἰς ἀδικίαν 8ḤevXII gr

Hab 1:15 במכמרתו – ἐν ταῖς σαγηναῖς αὐτοῦ LXX
ἐν τῇ] σαγήνῃ αὐτοῦ 8ḤevXII gr

Hab 2:2 ובאר – καὶ σαφῶς LXX (cf. Deut 27:8 LXX)
καὶ ἐκφάν[ειν or ἐκφάν[ηθι 8ḤevXII gr

III. Summary

Greek Texts in the Judean Desert

The discovery of Greek biblical texts in caves 2, 4 and 7 at Qumran as well as in Naḥal Ḥever probably implies that these texts were owned by the persons who brought them to these sites. Cave 7 probably contained an archive of Greek texts. We do not know to what extent the scrolls were also used by their owners, but some comparative evidence is available regarding the use of the Greek language in the same archaeological environment. Thus, in Naḥal Ḥever many Greek documentary texts have been deposited (see *DJD* XXVII), showing that Greek was in active use at that site, and hence the find of 8ḤevXII gr causes no surprise. The nature of the revision contained in this scroll fits what is otherwise known about the persons who deposited texts in Naḥal Ḥever at the time of the Second Jewish Revolt. On the other hand, active use of the Greek versions of the Pentateuch at Qumran is unlikely, as virtually no Greek documentary texts have been found there. The opisthograph 4QNarrative Work and Prayer (4Q460) in Hebrew, with a documentary Greek text 4QAccount gr (4Q350) on the verso of frg. 9 is unique, but possibly irrelevant as the Greek text may have been written after the period of occupancy of Qumran by the Qumran community (see above, § I).

The fact that the Greek Scripture texts found in cave 4 in Qumran are from the Torah only may be relevant to our understanding of the distribution of that text

and of the community's interest. The identity of many of the texts from cave 7 is unclear.

Greek was in active use in all sites in the Judean Desert, showing an administration conducted in Greek and letters written in that language, with the exception of Qumran. The percentage of Greek texts compared with Semitic texts found at these sites is much larger than that of the Greek texts found at Qumran.

The Text of the Greek Bible

If de Lagarde's theory on the history of the LXX needed any further support, it is provided by the texts from the Judean Desert. The newly found texts share important details with the manuscript tradition of the LXX known so far, so that all the known Greek texts reflect one single translation, rather than different translations, as suggested by Kahle.[41] Two of the Qumran texts probably reflect the OG better than the manuscript tradition contained in the later uncial manuscripts (4QLXXLev^{a}, 4QpapLXXLev^{b}; the evidence for 4QLXXNum is less clear). By implication, these two texts should also share certain features, but the evidence is too limited.

The differences between the Greek texts from Qumran and Naḥal Ḥever are remarkable. Two of the texts from Qumran provide insights into the early history of the LXX as they are probably better representatives of the OG than the later uncials. On the other hand, 8ḤevXII gr, an early Jewish revision of the OG, belonging to the *kaige*-Th group, represents a translation which is typologically later than the uncials and early papyri of the LXX, even if the particular copy found in Naḥal Ḥever is earlier than most surviving representatives of the LXX. The differences between the types of Greek text found in the two localities reflect the different nature of the groups of people who deposited the texts there.

The status of the Greek manuscripts from the Judean Desert thus runs parallel to that of the Hebrew manuscripts from the same area. The Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran reflect a variety of textual forms, among them proto-Masoretic texts, while those of the later sites of Naḥal Ḥever, Wadi Sdeir, Murabba'at, and Naḥal Ṣe'elim (as well as the earlier site of Masada) exclusively reflect the proto-Masoretic texts (also named proto-rabbinic texts) later to be contained in MT (to be precise, the texts from the sites other than Qumran are closer to the medieval text than the Qumran proto-Masoretic texts; see chapter 12*). Similarly, at least some of the Greek Torah texts from Qumran probably reflect an earlier form of Greek Scripture, while 8ḤevXII gr reflects a later Jewish revision deriving from proto-rabbinic Jewish circles. Both the Hebrew and Greek texts from Qumran

[41] The argumentation was used already by Leaney, "Greek Manuscripts," 293 and Skehan, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament," *BA* 28 (1965) 87–100, esp. 91–2.

thus reflect a community that practiced openness at the textual level and was not tied down to MT, while the other sites represent Jewish nationalistic circles that adhered only to the proto-rabbinic (proto-Masoretic) text in Hebrew and the Jewish revisions of the LXX towards that Hebrew text. The difference between the texts and sites derives partly from their differing chronological background, but more so from their socio-religious background.

Chapter Twenty-Four

The Evaluation of the Greek Scripture Translations in Rabbinic Sources

The topic of this chapter is the evaluation of the Greek translations in early rabbinic sources. It is often claimed that the earliest Greek translation, that of the seventy-two elders, was strongly disliked by rabbinic Judaism and was eventually replaced in Jewish communities by newer translations such as those of *kaige*-Th and Aquila. To what extent the Septuagint translation was indeed liked or disliked still needs to be analyzed,[1] but from the end of the first century CE onwards it clearly ceased to be influential in Judaism.[2] Before that time, the centrality of Greek Scripture within Christianity resulted from its importance within Judaism. However, in some books of the New Testament and in early Christian literature, Hebraizing revisions of the OG often were quoted rather than the OG version itself,[3] reflecting the beginning of the decline of the LXX (the OG) in Judaism. That decline continued with the growing centrality of the LXX in the new religion, Christianity, and it was that special status which created an atmosphere of distrust toward that translation in Jewish circles. But that distrust was first and foremost based on the growing recognition that the content of the LXX version differed from the Hebrew text that was in use in Palestine in the last two centuries BCE and the first centuries CE.[4]

Ironically, already in antiquity the use of the earliest and best-known Jewish translation was discontinued in its own environment. As the reason for the contempt, the post-Talmudic tractate *Soferim* states:

---

[1] For a summary of the opinions expressed on this issue, see Veltri, *Eine Tora,* 16–18.

[2] At the literary level, one of the last signs of the influence of the LXX was its central position in the writings of Josephus at the end of the first century CE.

[3] For a recent study, see M. J. J. Menken, *Matthew's Bible – The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist* (BETL 173; Leuven/Paris/Dudley: University Press/Peeters, 2004).

[4] The centrality of the LXX continues today in religious communities, since that translation has an authoritative and sacred status in the Russian and Greek Orthodox Churches. Thus, paradoxically, the only Scriptural basis for the Jewish festival of Chanukkah is 1 Maccabees (chapters 4–5), which was not accepted by rabbinic Judaism, but is now sacred in the Greek and Russian Orthodox Churches and has a special place in Catholicism. On a similar note, the Peshitta has a semi-authoritative status in the Syriac Orthodox Church (hence the modern translation of that version: *The Holy Bible from Ancient Eastern Manuscripts Containing the Old and New Testaments, Translated from the Peshitta, the Authorized Bible of the Church of the East* by G. M. Lamsa (9th ed.; Philadelphia: Holman, 1957).

מעשה בחמשה זקנים שכתבו לתלמי המלך את התורה יוונית והיה אותו היום קשה לישראל כיום שנעשה בו העגל שלא הייתה התורה יכולה להתרגם כל צרכה

It happened once that five elders wrote the Torah for King Ptolemy in Greek, and that day was as ominous for Israel as the day on which the golden calf was made,[5] since the Torah could not be accurately translated (*Sof.* 1.7).[6]

According to this tradition, the Torah, like the Koran, is untranslatable, and only the Hebrew source text should be considered binding. At the same time, this argument is not used for other biblical translations, viz., the Aramaic Targumim, as we shall see below. Jewish discontent with the LXX went as far as prompting the institution of a day of mourning for that translation commemorating an enterprise that was, at least according to tradition, initiated by the High Priest Eleazar himself. The instruction of the *Megillat Ta'anit Batra* to fast on the 8th of Tevet,[7] that was canceled in the Middle Ages, reminded religious Jews of the distortions of Scripture by the ancient translators. Likewise, the seventy-two translators are described in rabbinic literature as misrepresenting the content of the Hebrew Torah in 10–18 details (see below).[8]

---

[5] The translation of the Torah "for King Ptolemy" is described as idolatry, probably because it was made for a heathen. Furthermore, the strong condemnation of the translation stands in great contrast to the annual festivities instituted for the same translation according to the Epistle of Aristeas § 180.

[6] The latter part of this statement in the post-Talmudic tractate removed two crucial words from the earlier dictum of *y. Meg.* 1:11 (71c) שאין התורה יכולה להתרגם כל צרכה אלא יוונית (the Torah could be accurately translated only in Greek).

[7] The data are not found in the main sources of *Megillat Ta'anit*, but in a relatively late addition to that scroll, found in some manuscripts, namely *Megillat Ta'anit Batra*. See A. Neubauer, *Anecdota Oxoniensia, Chronicles and Chronological Notes Edited from Printed Books and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895) II.24. For an analysis, see G. Veltri, *Gegenwart*, 144–50. According to M. Friedländer, quoted by Veltri, 146, the day of fasting was already instituted in Palestine in the first century CE, if not earlier. See M. Friedländer, *Geschichte der jüdischen Apologetik* (Zürich: Caesar Schmidt, 1903; repr. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1973) 16 (however, Friedländer himself does not provide a date). On the other hand, S. Z. Leiman, "The Scroll of Fasts: The Ninth of Tebeth," *JQR* 74 (1983) 174–95 suggests that there is no evidence for the writing of *Megillat Ta'anit Batra* before the time of *Halakhot Gedolot* (8th–9th century) and therefore the institution of the fast cannot be dated before that period.

[8] This description is not shared by Veltri, *Eine Tora*. The main thesis of Veltri, described on pp. 107–12, relating to the lists of readings/changes in the LXX, is that these were originally independent readings that were sometimes combined into clusters of two or three instances, and only later joined (by the *soferim*) to the lists that are now found in several places in the rabbinic literature. The background of these readings/changes is that they were actually written "for King Ptolemy," the one on whose behalf the exegetical changes were inserted in the translation. This is a very central point in the argumentation of Veltri, from which the book derives its name: *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*. That is, the rabbis prepared a written midrash for King Ptolemy since he did not have the advantage of studying Torah with the rabbis (p. 108). For the rabbis, this written Torah was the LXX! That the LXX contained such an exegetical copy of the Torah can also be inferred from the use of the term דבר, introducing the individual readings/changes (זה אחד מן הדברים ששינו/שכתבו לתלמי המלך), parallel to the term דבר אחר introducing an alterna-

In the wake of these negative opinions of the LXX, we want to devote some attention to the history of the Jewish evaluation of *all* the Greek translations. It is probably appropriate to do so in Leiden,[9] where the evaluation of the LXX underwent changes in the scholarly mind.[10] This discussion in seventeenth century Leiden pertained to very academic matters, which were also central to theological positions within the Church. Likewise, in antiquity the debate over the use of either the OG translation or a newer Jewish version became a central issue in Palestine.

Our analysis will proceed step-by-step, dealing with the Jewish character of the LXX, its use in Jewish communities, the emergence and Jewish background of new Greek translations, and the approach of the rabbis towards the LXX and Aquila, with an appendix regarding the so-called changes by the Greek translators.

1. The LXX is a Jewish Translation

The OG version of the Torah was a Jewish enterprise. It is probably necessary to stress this fact since several centuries later, the LXX was considered to be Christian literature since the vocabulary, wording, and content of the OG version was central to the wording and formation of the New Testament and of the new religion. Subsequently, the OG was considered to be the inspired translation of Hebrew Scripture, and as a result the two Greek "Testaments" were transmitted together in Christianity, often in large-scope manuscripts. Without Christianity, we would not have been blessed with so many good manuscripts of the Greek version of the Old Testament.

The Jewish background and character of this translation lived strongly in early traditions; for example, an early source like the Epistle of Aristeas stressed the fact that the translation was guided by the High Priest, Eleazar, who sent scrolls from Jerusalem to be translated in Egypt.[11] Such was also the message of rabbinic literature, in which, however, the High Priest is not mentioned. See the story in *b. Meg.* 9a to be quoted below. Likewise, *Sof.* 1.7: "It happened once that five elders wrote the Torah for King Ptolemy in Greek" (the continuation of that sentence is

---

tive explanation in rabbinic literature. According to Veltri, the original tradition spoke about "writing" to Ptolemy, secondarily altered to "changing" (p. 108).

[9] This study was first presented to the meeting of the IOSCS in Leiden, September 2004.

[10] J. C. H. Lebram, "Ein Streit um die hebräische Bibel und die Septuaginta," in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century* (ed. Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer and G. H. M. Posthumus Meyjes; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975) 21–63.

[11] § 310–11. The various, mainly Christian, sources for this tradition have been collected by P. Wendland, *Aristeae ad Philocratem Epistula cum ceteris de origine versionis LXX interpretum testimoniis* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1900); H. St.J. Thackeray, *The Letter of Aristeas, Translated with an Appendix of Ancient Evidence on the Origin of the Septuagint* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918).

mentioned above), and 1.8: "Another story about King Ptolemy …" (here follows the same story as in *b. Meg.* 9a).

Internal analysis confirms the Jewish character of this translation, which shows more links with rabbinic interpretations than the other Greek versions.[12] Furthermore, the vocabulary of that translation often reveals its Jewish background, evidenced by the use of Aramaic names for festivals (σάββατα, Πασχα) and for a Jewish concept (גר – γειώρας) as well as the distinction between the Jewish (ὁλοκαύτωμα) and pagan altars (βωμός). By the same token, several neologisms coined to express specifically biblical ideas, probably reflect their Jewish background (e. g., ἁγιαστήριον – מקדש, θυσιαστήριον – מזבח).[13]

2. Use of the LXX in Jewish Communities

There is ample literary evidence for the notion that the LXX was read in religious gatherings[14] of Greek-speaking communities from the first century BCE onwards.[15] Among other things, Philo refers to such a custom in Alexandria.[16] For additional sources, among them 4 Macc 18:10–18 and the Theodotos inscription from Jerusalem, see chapter 12*, § II.

---

[12] For examples, see the scholarly literature on the Torah, Joshua, 1–2 Kings, Isaiah, Job, Proverbs, and Daniel: Frankel, *Einfluss*; J. Fürst, "Spüren der palästinisch-jüdischen Schriftdeutung und Sagen in der Übersetzung der LXX," *Semitic Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. A. Kohut* (Berlin: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1897) 152–66; L. Ginzberg, "Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern und in der apokryphischen Literatur," *MGWJ* 42 (1898) 537–50; 43 (1899) 17 ff.; V. Aptowitzer, "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata," *ZAW* 29 (1909) 241–52; Prijs, *Tradition*; Gooding, "Text and Midrash"; S. Safrai, "Halakha," in *The Literature of the Sages. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section Two, 3 (ed. S. Safrai; Assen-Maastricht and Philadelphia: Fortress Press/Van Gorcum, 1987) 137–9. Additional literature on rabbinic exegesis before 1948 is mentioned by Prijs, *Tradition,* xiii and 105. See further Tov, "Midrash-Type Exegesis."

[13] See the study quoted in chapter 22*, n. 15.

[14] A prerequisite for the use of the LXX in Jewish communities would seem to have been that the translation be understood by the ancients. However, illogical as it may be, this is not a *conditio sine qua non* for Holy Scripture for which the public had and still has a great deal of tolerance. See C. Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the LXX," *Textus* 6 (1968) 1–26.

[15] Early papyri of the Torah from Egypt (P.Ryl. Gk. 458 [first half of the second century BCE] and P.Fouad [first century BCE]) show that the Greek translation was known in various parts of the country though not necessarily used in religious gatherings.

[16] See chapter 12*, n. 72.

3. Emergence of New Greek Translations

Although the OG translation was used widely in Egypt and Palestine, less than a century after the *completion* of that version several new Jewish translations were authored, probably at first in Palestine. The emergence of these new versions should be seen as a reaction to new developments in the ever-changing textual reality of Palestine. Thus, when the LXX was brought from Egypt to Palestine, it was soon recognized that the content of that translation differed considerably from the then current Palestinian Hebrew text.

As a consequence, in the strict religious climate of Palestine from the first century BCE onwards, it became important for religious leaders to discontinue the use of the OG translation. The adherence to the then current Hebrew/Aramaic text involved the creation of new Greek versions reflecting that text. This factor was apparently more instrumental in the creation of the new Greek versions than others mentioned in the scholarly literature. At a later stage, the frequent use of the LXX by Christians did indeed cause Jews to dissociate themselves from that translation, but the OG had already been revised before the birth of Christianity. By the same token, the assumption that a need was felt for new Jewish-Greek versions that would reflect Jewish exegesis better than the earlier ones is not borne out by the evidence.[17]

These new translations are usually described as revisions of the OG version, since the new versions did not embody novel translation enterprises; rather, they revised in some way or other the OG translation.[18]

4. Jewish Background of the New Greek Translations

In none of the biblical translations are the Jewish characteristics more clearly visible than in the Targumim. These Targumim agree so frequently with biblical exegesis embedded in rabbinic literature that they may be considered "in-house productions" by rabbinic circles. In rabbinic literature, this exegesis is scattered in a vast literature, but in the Targumim it follows the sequence of the biblical text, so that it may be said that these Targumim served as official rabbinic companion volumes to Hebrew Scripture. Indeed, according to Tal,[19] from the outset, the Targumim were intended to facilitate exegesis and modernization in translation,

[17] In fact, the LXX reflects more exponents of Jewish exegesis than the newer versions (see below). As a result, my own formulations in *TCHB,* 143 should be revised.

[18] In some cases, the revision reworked an earlier revision which itself was based on the OG version. Thus Aquila and Symmachus revised the earlier *kaige*-Th. See Barthélemy, *Devanciers*, 81–8, 246 ff.

[19] A. Tal, "Is There a Raison d'Être for an Aramaic Targum in a Hebrew-Speaking Society?" *REJ* 160 (2001) 357–78.

so that the Hebrew text itself could be left unaltered. The presence of these companion volumes should be viewed against the background of the lack of rewritten rabbinic Bible compositions like e. g., Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Temple Scroll, *pesharim* and many Qumran commentaries on biblical books.[20] Therefore, the emergence of the Targumim in rabbinic sources runs parallel with the writing of parabiblical compositions in other circles.

If the degree of Jewishness of a translation can be measured at all, the Targumim are closest to rabbinic literature, followed at a great distance by the LXX and Peshitta of the Torah.[21] The LXX presented only a thin layer of Jewish exegesis, with the newer Greek versions showing even less.

These revisions of the OG translation reflect an approach of exact representation of the source text, which follows the ideals of several rabbinical scholars, but explicit Jewish exegesis is hardly detectable in the new versions. In spite of the remark in the *Palestinian* Talmud that the Greek translator Aquila was a student of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua (*y. Meg.* 1:11 [71c]),[22] there is little evidence for the assumption that Aquila reflects rabbinic exegesis.[23] By the same token, there is very little evidence in favor of the claim that the earlier *kaige*-Th revision made a special effort to reflect such exegesis, as claimed by Barthélemy in his *Devanciers d'Aquila*.[24] Already in 1972 the present author expressed his doubts regarding

---

[20] See S. L. Berrin, "Pesharim," in *Encyclopedia DSS,* 2.644–7; M. J. Bernstein, ibid., 1.376–83 ("Interpretation of Scriptures"); idem, "Pentateuchal Interpretation," in *DSS After Fifty Years,* 1.128–59.

[21] See Y. Maori, *The Peshitta Version of the Pentateuch and Early Jewish Exegesis* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995).

[22] In *b. Meg.* 3a, on the other hand, the same remark refers to Onkelos, the translator of the *Aramaic* Targum: "The Targum of the Pentateuch was composed by Onkelos the proselyte under the guidance of R. Eleazar and R. Joshua."

[23] Possibly the major argument adduced in favor of such an assumption is the assumed link between the translation of the *nota accusativi* את and the Greek σύν as in Gen 1:1 בראשית ברא אלהים את השמים ואת הארץ – ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἔκτισεν θεὸς σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν. Usually it is claimed that this equivalent (σύν generally followed by the accusative) reflects the rabbinic rule of *ribbuy umi'ut* (inclusion and exclusion), one of the thirty-two hermeneutical rules (*middot*) of R. Eliezer ben Yose ha-Gelili. This rule covers certain Hebrew particles that are always presumed to include at least one element in addition to the word(s) mentioned after it. Thus, גם, "also," is usually translated in *kaige*-Th with καίγε, "at least." However, this assumption does not appropriately explain the equivalence את – σύν, which should probably be explained as reflecting a stereotyped rendering of all occurrences of את not as the *nota accusativi*, but as -את, "with." In other words, linguistic consistency for the two meanings of את rather than Jewish exegesis forms the background of this special rendering. The lack of Jewish exegesis in Aquila is also noticed by Veltri, *Gegenwart*, 76. On the other hand, Aquila's namesake Onkelos, the author of the Aramaic translation, often reflects rabbinic exegesis.

[24] Note the subtitle of Barthélemy, *Devanciers*: *Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton, trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinate palestinien*.

Barthélemy's theory,[25] and in 1990 Greenspoon summarized the various criticisms voiced against it.[26] The main exponent of Jewish exegesis visible in the new Greek versions is probably the representation of the Tetragrammaton with paleo-Hebrew characters in several manuscripts.[27]

5. Approach towards the LXX in Rabbinic Literature

It has been claimed often, by the present author among others,[28] that prior to or simultaneous with the creation of the new Jewish versions, the LXX was rejected by forerunners of rabbinic Judaism. On the other hand, Veltri[29] suggested that when the rabbinic traditions are properly analyzed, they do not provide evidence for such an approach. Basing our discussion on a source analysis of *b. Meg.* 9a, we will defend the view that both approaches are reflected in rabbinic literature.

In general, I wonder whether one may speak of the rejection of a text if it had not been accepted previously. We therefore need to examine whether the LXX was embraced at one point by the Palestinian authorities and, if so, when? For one thing, we should take care not to make anachronistic and geographic mistakes by comparing procedures taking place centuries apart.

Greek Bible scrolls are mentioned in the Talmud in a general way. The sacred status of such scrolls is defended in *b. Shabb.* 115a[30] and *Meg.* 9a regarding all Greek Scripture scrolls, and in *b. Meg.* 18a regarding the Esther scroll. However, these texts have no implications for the rabbinic evaluation of the LXX.

There is no direct evidence showing that the Pharisees or later rabbis actively used the LXX or cherished that translation.[31] Neither, however, are the other versions quoted much; there are only a few references to Aquila and the Targumim.

---

[25] Tov, "Methodology." All characteristic renderings of *kaige*-Th were explained by Barthélemy in the light of occasional statements in rabbinic literature, mainly in the Mekhilta, e. g. the translation of איש, "everyone" with ἀνήρ, אנכי with ἐγώ εἰμι, and the etymological translation of the roots יצב/נצב. However, Barthélemy probably went too far in his desire to explain all renderings of *kaige*-Th in accordance with rabbinic exegesis. It is more likely that these equivalents – with the possible exception of גם – καίγε – simply represent a literal, root-linked translation technique in which each Hebrew root is represented by its fixed equivalent.

[26] L. J. Greenspoon, "Recensions, Revision, Rabbinics: Dominique Barthélemy and Early Developments in the Greek Traditions," *Textus* 15 (1990) 153–63. See further L. L. Grabbe, "Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis," *JJS* 33 (1982) 527–36.

[27] The evidence is presented in *Scribal Practices,* 220.

[28] *TCHB*, 143.

[29] Veltri, *Eine Tora*, passim (see *Konklusion*, 215–9).

[30] "If they are written in Egyptian, Median, עיברית, Aramaic, Elamitic, or Greek, though they may not be read, they may be saved from a fire."

[31] Similarly Veltri, *Eine Tora,* 19 and passim.

However, while it is irrelevant to speak of the rejection of the LXX, it is true that that translation was *disregarded* in rabbinic literature. This fact is not surprising as the rabbis were involved in legal discussions as part of their search for the best way(s) to explain and implement the divine Torah in daily life. In these legal discussions, no external sources were quoted, neither Jewish nor pagan, neither contemporary Roman law books nor old Mesopotamian clay tablets; instead, they relied solely upon their own internal logic.[32] As a result, there was no occasion for consulting the OG translation, even though according to tradition that translation was divinely inspired, and its exegesis could have been made the base for specific legal decisions. There was, however, occasion for such quotations in the vast midrashic literature, but there, too, the LXX was disregarded. The use of ancient Greek translations is limited to a handful of quotations from Aquila (not in the Bab. Talmud; see below), Onkelos and Jonathan in the later rabbinic literature[33] (not in the literature of the Tannaim). When they are quoted, these Aramaic translations are referred to as "in-house products," often phrased as מתרגמינן, "we translate."[34] It is thus clear that the Targum is part of the world of the rabbis, while the LXX is not.

Individual readings of the LXX are quoted only once, not as part of the context, but within a *baraita* that accuses the translators of altering Hebrew Scripture.

Knowing that the LXX formed the basis for the formative and authoritative writings of Christianity, scholars looked for hints that the rabbis rejected the LXX in favor of the newer versions. However, it seems that there is no evidence for the assumption of an active rejection of the LXX. That translation was disregarded like all other external sources, with the exception of a few quotations from Aquila, and a number of quotations from Onkelos and Jonathan, but far fewer than expected.

---

[32] Indeed, a modern discussion of the type of arguments used in the Talmudic discourse contains no reference to external sources used in the Talmud: L. Moscovitz, *Talmudic Reasoning–From Casuistics to Conceptualization* (TSAJ 89; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 2002).

[33] Some evidence has been collected by E. Z. Melamed, *Bible Commentators* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975) 1.141–3. Other evidence, less clearly visible because it is at variance with Targum Jonathan on the Prophets, has been collected by M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Fragments of Lost Targumim* (Heb.; 2 vols.; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1983, 1989). See also H. Sysling, "Three Harsh Prophets – A Targumic *Tosefta* to *Parashat Korah*," *Aramaic Studies* 2 (2004) 223–42 (224, n. 7). I owe these references to S. Kogut and H. Sysling.

[34] E. g. *b. Shabb.* 10b (Deut 7:9); 64a (Num 31:50); *Gittin* 68b (Lev 11:13). The full evidence is accessible with the aid of the electronic database of the Bar-Ilan Responsa Project.

6. Approach towards Aquila in Rabbinic Literature

In contrast to the lack of quotations from the OG translation in rabbinic literature, the version of Aquila (עקילס הגר, "the proselyte Aquila") is quoted ten times in the Palestinian Talmud, Genesis Rabba, Leviticus Rabba, Shir Hashirim Rabba, Echa Rabba, Esther Rabba, and Qohelet Rabba, but not in the Babylonian Talmud.[35] Under normal circumstances, in this vast corpus of rabbinic literature, these ten quotations would be considered a negligible quantity, were it not that they are not matched by any quotations from the OG or other Greek versions. The ten instances have been discussed in the literature,[36] especially by Veltri.[37]

In these quotations, Aquila's Greek rendering is usually provided in Hebrew transliteration, followed by its Hebrew translation. Thus on Ps 48:15 הוא ינהגנו על מות, *y. Meg.* 5.4 (73b) says תרגם עקילס אתנסיה עולם שאין בו מות.[38] Aquila thus read or understood the Hebrew as אל מות with an *'aleph*.

In another instance, in Gen 17:1 אני אל שדי, "I am the God Shadday," Aquila's reading is quoted in conjunction with the opinion that שדי should not be read as Shadday but as *she-day* (probably: "he who is sufficient").[39]

Aquila's version thus enjoyed a special position for certain rabbinic authorities, probably less as an ancient version, and more as a source for rabbinic philological interpretation. After all, he was described and "praised"[40] as a student of R. Eliezer and R. Joshua (*y. Meg.* 1:11 [71c]).[41]

---

[35] These quotations are repeated in the late midrashic compilations such as the Yalqut Shimony and Midrash Tanhuma (located with the aid of the CD of the Bar-Ilan Responsa Project).

[36] A. E. Silverstone, *Aquila and Onkelos* (Manchester: University Press, 1931); J. Reider, "Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila," *JQR 7* (1916–1917) 287–361.

[37] Veltri, *Gegenwart*, 83–90.

[38] Likewise *y. Moed Qatan* 3.7 (83b) אתנא סירא.

[39] In the running text: "… It was said in the name of R. Yitzhaq: אני אל שדי, I am the one who said to the world, *dayyi*, it suffices. … It was said in the name of R. Eliezer son of Jacob, the world and everything in it is not sufficient without my divinity. Aquila rendered ואיקנוס אקסיוס (Gen. Rabba 46:1 [ed. Theodor-Albeck, 460–61])." The exact form of Aquila's rendering has been reconstructed in different ways on the basis of the Hebrew transcriptions in the various manuscripts, of which the best reconstruction is probably ἄξιος καὶ ἱκανός, a double rendering based on both *k*^{e}*-day* (worthy) and *day* ([self-] sufficient).

[40] קילסו אותו.

[41] According to Veltri, *Gegenwart*, 93–101, Aquila's translation was considered by the rabbis to be an oral Targum for which the term *tirgem* ("translate") was used as opposed to *katab* ("wrote") describing the activity of the 72 translators. However, the argument provided by Veltri is debatable. Veltri notes that the same word ("to translate") is used for the Aramaic Targumim and Aquila's translation, the implication being that both were oral, while the activity of the first Greek translators is described as "writing." However, the two terms refer to different activities. The LXX translation is quoted only with reference to the *story* that the LXX translators *wrote*

7. Different Views of the LXX Reflected in Rabbinic Literature

With the exception of the list of alterations by the Greek translators, no readings or interpretations of the OG have been quoted in rabbinic literature.

Rabbinic literature basically disregards the content of this translation, but in the sole mention of that version, it is described paradoxically as both an inspired text and a distorted translation of Hebrew Scripture, in that sequence. The two diametrically opposed opinions are mentioned in one breath in *b. Meg.* 9a:

> And it goes on to state, 'R. Judah said: When our teachers permitted Greek, they permitted it only for a scroll of the *Torah*'. This was on account of the story told in connection with King Ptolemy. It has been taught 'It is related of King Ptolemy that he brought together seventy-two elders and placed them in seventy-two rooms, and he went into each one individually and ordered them "write for me the Torah of your Teacher Moses." The Holy One, blessed be He, put wisdom in the heart of each one so that they agreed with one accord and wrote for him "God created in the beginning …" <here follows the list of the 15 'changes'>.

The *baraita* contains the following elements as one consecutive story:

a. It is permissible to write (copy) the Torah into Greek, as opposed to the other Scripture books.

b. The Greek Torah is singled out for positive treatment because of the story told about the miraculous and divinely inspired translation enterprise.[42]

c. The miraculous translation included 15 details that were "written for King Ptolemy." All these details in the OG differ from MT and, in two instances, the text before the alteration by the translators is explicitly mentioned.[43] Therefore, although this *baraita* and the parallel in *Mek.* speak of "writing," other texts speak of an "alteration," which is clearly the implication of the list in *b. Meg.* as well.[44]

Turning now to a source analysis of the story in *b. Meg.* 9a,[45] I suggest that the sequence of the elements narrated is unnatural because of the juxtaposition of admiration for an inspired translation and an account of the alterations inserted by the translators which implies major criticism of these translators who "dared"

---

their translation for King Ptolemy. It is not used for the quotation of single words from a translation, as in the case of Aquila.

[42] Different versions of the same story are found in the Epistle of Aristeas; Philo, *Vita Mos.* 2.12–52; Josephus, *Ant.* XII 1–118; as well as later sources. According to I. Gruenwald, these accounts were meant to repel certain challenges voiced against the translation: "Polemical Attitudes toward the Septuagint," *Teudah* 2 (1986) 65–78 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

[43] (4) "Male and female he created him" and they did not write "he created them" (Gen 5:2; the final three words are lacking in several parallel sources); (15) and they wrote for him צעירת רגלים and they did not write ארנבת (Lev 11:6 [5], Deut 14:7). The numbers in parenthesis refer to the list in *b. Meg.* 9a.

[44] *Y. Meg.*: "thirteen details were changed by the sages for King Ptolemy; they wrote for him …"; *Midr. Hagadol* Exod 4:20: "this is one of the eighteen details which our Rabbis changed in the Torah in Greek." Similarly, *Sof.* 1.7.

[45] The analysis also pertains to the parallels in *Yal. Shim.* Gen 3 and *Sof.* 1.7.

to change Holy Scripture. This unnatural combination suggests that at an earlier stage the two elements were unconnected. After all, following the description of the miraculous event, when examples are given showing the method of translation, one would expect many types of renderings, but not those actually given in *b. Meg.* In the present context, the only examples provided for the content of the miraculous translation enterprise are these "distorted" renderings.

This unnatural sequence of the elements in *b. Meg.* reflects, in a nutshell, the complexity of the evaluation of the Greek translation in rabbinic sources, which is sometimes positive, but mostly negative. To the originally positive story regarding the translation, the list of criticisms may have been added at a later stage when admiration for the translation was replaced by criticism of its content as described above.

The fact that these two evaluations have been juxtaposed in the *baraita* in tractate *Megillah* and elsewhere should cause no surprise, since in rabbinic literature many diverse elements have been juxtaposed. Such juxtaposed layers involve the associative combination of elements that are not always relevant to the context, and sometimes even contradictory to it. In modern terminology, added elements are often in the nature of a footnote. In this case, the combination of the diverse elements is instructive since it shows two levels of evaluation of the LXX, positive and negative, in this sequence. These two approaches cannot be dated absolutely, but the positive evaluation must reflect the original approach towards the OG, while criticism of that version would have arisen whenever the differences between the Palestinian Hebrew text and the LXX were recognized, probably from the first century BCE onwards.

The complexity of the evidence explains why it has been difficult to decide whether or not the LXX was rejected by the rabbis. It seems that both approaches are reflected in rabbinic literature, for which the *baraita* in *b. Meg.* 9a provides the main evidence.

8. Summary

The OG is an Egyptian Jewish translation whose use was discontinued by the Jews of Palestine when its discrepancies from the text current in Palestine were recognized. At that point, newer Jewish versions, not necessarily reflecting more Jewish exegesis than the OG, were created. Are these historical developments reflected in rabbinic literature?

a. The content of the LXX is disregarded in rabbinic literature, probably because that corpus does not quote from external sources, with the exception of a handful of quotations from Aquila and a greater number of quotations from the Targumim.

b. Some scholars claim that rabbinic literature attests to the rejection of the LXX by Palestinian Judaism. We suggested that both positive and negative approaches towards the LXX are evidenced. This is visible in the juxtaposition in *b. Meg.* 9a of a tradition reflecting admiration for an inspired translation and alterations inserted during the course of the translation enterprise.

c. The translation of Aquila, quoted ten times in rabbinic literature, must have enjoyed a special position for certain rabbinic authorities, probably less as an ancient version, and more as a source for rabbinic philological exegesis.

d. The *list* presents a separate document enumerating not only real differences between Hebrew and Greek Scripture, but also inner-Hebrew exegetical readings that probably had nothing to do with the LXX (see the Appendix).

Appendix: Tendencies in the List of the So-called Changes

Various passages within rabbinic literature cite a series of 10–18 alterations by the Greek translators of the Torah.[46] Only five passages are identical to the known text of the LXX (3, 8, 10, 11, 15), with another one (9) being close to it. The assumption that the Hebrew list goes back to Greek words translated into Hebrew is well substantiated by passage 15.

The *list* presents a separate document enumerating not only real differences between Hebrew and Greek Scripture, but also inner-Hebrew exegetical readings that had nothing to do with the LXX. This was shown in detail by Veltri[47] in a book-sized discussion devoted to the *baraita* in Tractate *Megillah*. In my earlier study, I presented a different opinion when reconstructing the Greek readings behind the details in the list, but I now realize that several of these readings should not be retroverted into Greek,[48] and, in fact, not all the details in the list

[46] The principal sources for the rabbinic tradition are: *b. Meg.* 9a; *y. Meg.* 1, 1, 4, p. 72a; *Mek.* Exod 12, 40; *Midr. Hagadol* Exod 4, 20; *Abot de-R. Nat.* version B, chapter 37; *Sof.* 1. 7; *Yal. Shim.* Gen 3; *Midr. Tan.* Exod § 22. Additional sources are listed in M. Higger, מסכת סופרים (New York: Debe-Rabbanan, 1937; repr. Jerusalem: Makor, 1970) 101. It is impossible to determine with certainty which among these lists mentioned is the original or the nearest to it. The lists in *b. Meg.*, *y. Meg.* and *Mek.* are the most ancient among the sources, but we lack proven criteria in order to evaluate the differences between these sources themselves. For the texts themselves and a detailed analysis, see Tov, "Rabbinic Tradition."

[47] Veltri, *Eine Tora.* Some of the readings quoted as "changes" are mentioned in various rabbinic sources as *Hebrew* variants unconnected to the LXX. For example, the unusual sequence of the text written "for King Ptolemy" in Gen 1:1 ("God created in the beginning") reflects questions raised and solutions given in Gen. Rab. 1:14 and *Tanḥ. Buber Bereshit* 4 – see pp. 25–31. The addition in Deut. 17:3 "for King Ptolemy," לעבדם, is paralleled by an identical addition in *Siphre Deut.* 148 (pp. 92–7).

[48] Tov, "Rabbinic Tradition," in *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 75–82.

should be taken at face value.[49] The unreliability of many details in the list is paralleled by similar lists of textual data in which not every detail should be taken seriously: not all the "emendations of the scribes"[50] reflect real corrections,[51] *al tiqrê* readings ("do not read X, but Y") do not reflect different readings but serve as an exegetical play with letters, and the enigmatic *baraita* about the three copies of the Torah found in the temple court cannot be taken at face value.[52]

The original list of "changes" of the LXX translators was very brief, and it may have been expanded in order to enhance criticism of the LXX. The details in the present form of the list are not at all typical of the textual and exegetical differences between the OG and the Hebrew text, and it is unclear whether the present or original list has a focus at all.

That the Greek translators were accused of altering the message of the original is understandable in the cultural climate of Palestine. Such a claim is natural in the relations between religious groups. A similar claim was made by Jews against the Samaritans as related in the Talmud (זייפתם תורתכם, "You have falsified your Torah"),[53] and by Justin Martyr defending the LXX against the Jews.[54]

---

[49] In the words of Veltri, *Eine Tora*, 112: "Die *Devarim* sind keine textkritische Liste. Vielmehr stellen sie eine 'fiktive Überlieferung' dar, mit deren Hilfe die Rabbinen/ Redaktoren Schwierigkeiten der Bibelexegese auszuraümen versuchten."

[50] See *Sifre* 84 to Num 10:35 (18 instances), *Mek. Shirata* 6 to Exod 15:7 (11 or 9 instances), Midrash Tanḥuma Beshallaḥ to Exod 15:7 (18 instances).

[51] Several (all?) instances described as "corrections" are merely exegetical euphemisms. See W. E. Barnes, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament (Tiḳḳun Sopherim)," *JTS* 1 (1899–1900) 387–414; C. McCarthy, *The Tiqqune Sopherim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament* (OBO 36; Freiburg/Göttingen, 1981); M. A. Zipor, "Some Notes on the Origin of the Tradition of the Eighteen Tiqqûnê Sôp^{e}rîm," *VT* 44 (1994) 77–102; S. Schorch, *Euphemismen in der Hebräischen Bibel* (Orientalia biblica et christiana 12; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2000).

[52] See my analysis in chapter 12*.

[53] *B. Sotah* 33b; *b. Sanh.* 90b.

[54] Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, *passim*, esp. § 71–73.

Chapter Twenty-Five

Biliteral Exegesis of Hebrew Roots in the Septuagint?

1. Background

The first step in any translational activity is the attempt to identify the form and meaning of each word in the source language, without which the translating procedure is not feasible. In the absence of auxiliary tools such as lexicons and concordances, ancient biblical translators thus had to rely on their own knowledge of the Hebrew/Aramaic languages, the context of the words in the source language, and exegetical traditions.

Reliance on the context is an important source of information for any translator. In the hands of the ancients, however, such reliance often amounts to what we would consider conjectural renderings (guessing), even though the boundary between adaptation to the context and guessing is very vague. It can often be made plausible that translators produced conjectural renderings on the basis of the context when a Hebrew word is rendered in completely different ways in accordance with the different contexts in which it appears.[1] Another type of conjectural rendering involves a translation that disregards some of the letters of the Hebrew word.[2] Some aspects of the translators' lexical and grammatical knowledge, especially in the realm of verbal forms, are discussed in this paper.

As we focus in this study on some of the deficiencies of the translators, we should probably first remark that the Greek translators were often surprisingly well informed with regard to rarely occurring words or forms in Scripture. In the analysis of the translators' lexical sources, some unusual sources are also encountered. Thus, some striking resemblances between translation equivalents in the LXX and words in Akkadian[3] and Arabic[4] (often misleadingly called

---

[1] For examples of conjectural renderings, see Tov, "Septuagint Translators." For a different view of the nature of guessing, referring mainly to the issue of vocalization, see J. Barr, "'Guessing' in the Septuagint," in Fraenkel, *Studien zur Septuaginta*, 19–34.

[2] Examples of such conjectural renderings are provided in *TCU*, 172–80.

[3] For some examples, see G. R. Driver, "L'Interprétation du texte masorétque à la lumière de la lexicographie hébraïque," ALBO II, 18 (Louvain/Bruges–Paris, 1950) = *ETL* 26 (1950) 337–53.

[4] For examples and a discussion, see Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 201–2; G. R. Driver, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament. VII," *JTS* 35 (1934) 380–93; part VIII, ibid., 36 (1935)

"Arabisms") may imply that the translators drew on lexical information for Hebrew that was known in their time but subsequently lost. The translators' reliance on the Aramaic language resulted from a different situation. Aramaic was a living language when the translation was made, and the translators were probably equally familiar with that language as with Hebrew. The translators possibly based themselves more on Aramaic than Hebrew, but because of the close resemblance between these two languages one cannot distinguish between the translators' different sources. However, when the LXX agrees with an Aramaic root that has a meaning different from its Hebrew counterpart, such inappropriate reliance on Aramaic can be established easily.[5] Other mishaps occurred when the translator chose a wrong translation on the basis of postbiblical rather than biblical Hebrew.[6] Finally, the Greek Pentateuch often served as a source of lexical information for later translators.[7]

The main source of lexical information for the translators thus was their living knowledge of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages, which allowed them to determine the semantic content of words in their *Vorlagen*. However, before that information could be utilized, the translators had to analyze the morphological nature of the word being translated in order to determine, for example, whether it was a noun or a verb. If it was a verb, we wonder whether the translator took further steps in his analysis. In accordance with the grammatical concepts that developed from medieval times onwards, the translators may have had to determine the root of the verb, as well as its conjugation (*binyan*), aspect, and tense. How else would a translator be able to distinguish between such homographic consonantal forms as the *pi'el wayedabber* ("he spoke") and the *hiph'il wayadber* in Ps 18:48 and 47:4 ("he subdued"; correctly rendered by the LXX with forms of ὑποτάσσω)? However, it seems that the translators did not have to go through these analytical stages in the case of verbs. It need not be assumed that the translators were aware of such abstractions as "roots" or conjugations

293–301; D. Winton Thomas, "The Language of the Old Testament," in *Record and Revelation* (ed. H. W. Robinson; Oxford: Clarendon, 1938) 374–402; Barr, *Comparative Philology,* 238–45.

[5] For examples and an analysis, see J. Joosten, "On Aramaising Renderings in the Septuagint," *Hamlet on a Hill. Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen; OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003) 587–600. For an earlier analysis, see *TCU*, 249–50.

[6] For many examples and an analysis, see the valuable studies by J. Joosten, "The Knowledge and Use of Hebrew in the Hellenistic Period. Qumran and the Septuagint," in *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; Leiden, E. J. Brill, 2000) 115–30; "On the LXX Translators' Knowledge of Hebrew," in Taylor, *X Congress,* 165–79; "Biblical Hebrew as Mirrored in the Septuagint: The Question of Influence from Spoken Hebrew," *Textus* 21 (2002) 1–19; "Linguistic Innovations in the Hebrew of the Hellenistic Period: Qumran and the Septuagint," *Meghillot* 2 (2004) 151–5 (Heb.). See further: Frankel, *Vorstudien*, 201; J. Blau, "Zum Hebräisch der Übersetzer des AT," *VT* 6 (1956) 98–100.

[7] See Tov, "Pentateuch."

when identifying meaningful elements in verbs. They possibly had only a vague understanding of such abstractions as conjugations, which included the distinction between the *qal*, *hiph'il*, and *hitpa'el* forms of the same root. It sufficed for the translators to distinguish between a form reflecting "something like the *qal*" and a form incorporating "something like the *hiph'il*." In all likelihood, together with that base knowledge of meaningful patterns in the Hebrew/Aramaic verbs, the translators probably recognized clusters of meaningful elements or word patterns that allowed them to identify the essence of the Hebrew verb. After all, it sufficed to distinguish between *wydbr* 1 (= *wayedabber*) carrying meaning 1 and *wydbr* 2 (*wayadber*) carrying meaning 2.

The translation was thus based on the understanding of the semantic content of clusters of consonants (letters) in Hebrew/Aramaic, and the actual reading or pronunciation ("vocalization" in later times) and parsing are not a necessary part of the translation process.[8]

The search for these determinative clusters of consonants in the source language is part and parcel of the procedure of etymological exegesis.[9] Thus, משארת ("kneading trough") in Deut 28:5, 17 was taken as a noun related to the verb שא"ר ("to remain"). The next step for the translator was to locate an equivalent Greek noun, in this case one derived from its Greek counterpart (ἐγ)καταλείπω, viz. ἐγκατάλειμμα. This etymological translation was based on the formal relation between the noun משארת and the root שא"ר, regardless of the fact that ἐγκατάλειμμα is not used in Greek as "kneading trough,"[10] but only as "that which was left."

Etymological exegesis lies at the base of all ancient translations, be it in its simple form, as in the example given above, or in more complex forms. This chapter focuses on one aspect of this procedure, namely exegesis involving a biliteral understanding of Hebrew words, especially verbs.

---

[8] Obviously, the understanding by the translators of the meaningful elements of a word sometimes differs from that of MT and/or modern understanding. Anachronistically, these different understandings are sometimes described as differences in vocalization. For analyses, see J. Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators," *VTSup* 16 (1967) 1–11; idem, "Reading a Script without Vowels," in *Writing without Letters* (ed. W. Haas; Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1976) 71–100; Tov, *TCU*, 159–74. See further Barr, "'Guessing' in the Septuagint."

[9] Various aspects of this assumed etymological procedure and its implications for the nature of the translation and its language have been discussed by U. Rapallo, *Calchi ebraici nelle antiche versioni del "Levitico"* (Studi Semitici 39; Rome: Istituto di studi del vicino oriente, Universita di Roma, 1971); Barr, *Literalism*.

[10] Accordingly, when LSJ ascribes to this word a meaning "kneading trough" on the basis of its occurrence in the LXX of Deuteronomy, it creates a meaning that did not exist at the time of the LXX translation. On this and other misconceptions with regard to the LXX in this otherwise excellent lexicon, see G. B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint," *JTS* 19 (1968) 453–75; 20 (1969) 21–41. Some of these imprecisions have been corrected in E. A. Barber, *A Greek-English Lexicon, A Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968); P. G. W. Glare, *Revised Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

2. Biliteral Exegesis?

Although most semantic identifications of verbs by the LXX translators are "correct," and most of them refer to triliteral Hebrew verbs, it does not necessarily follow that the translators followed a system of triliteral roots. The evidence merely shows that the translators were able to draw on various sources, enabling them to obtain the necessary semantic information. Triliteral verbs usually formed the basis for these identifications; for most of them (e.g. שמ"ר, עב"ד), all three letters were necessary for the identification, while in some cases two letters sufficed.

In the weak verbs (patterns פ"א, פ"י, פ"נ, ע"א, ע"ע, ע"ו, ל"א, ל"י), often only two radicals were needed for semantic identification. Thus for the rendering of עשׂיתם, the translator merely needed to identify the radicals עשׂ as relating to עש"ה, since the roots עשׂא*, עוש*, עשׁש*, יעש*, etc. do not exist and other options are therefore irrelevant. This is not a problematic case, nor are the translations of forms of סב"ב, since יס"ב*, אס"ב*, סו"ב*, נס"ב*, סב"ה* are not evidenced. These forms could be identified on the basis of the letters סב without taking a third radical into consideration. However, other instances are more complex since the opposition between verbs ל"א and ל"י, such as in the case of קנא ("to envy") and קנה ("to acquire"), necessitates either the examination of the third radical or reliance on the context. For an inappropriate choice in the קנ group, see below.

This description implies that the translators could make a shortcut by relying on merely two of the root letters. At the same time, it is not easy to substantiate this assumption for the LXX since the semantic information of most Hebrew verbs is correctly identified, and one needs to make a strong case proving that the translation of certain verbal forms was based on only two letters. Nevertheless, there are such instances, since mistaken renderings suggest that in some cases *two* letters sufficed for the semantic identification of verbal forms. We take our clue from assumed shortcuts by the translators in the identification process. For some verbs, a cluster of two letters sufficed for identification, but if that abbreviated cluster was the key for two *different* verbs, mishaps could occur, as, for example, in the case of רא pointing to both the ל"י verb רא"ה ("to see") and the פ"י verb יר"א ("to fear"):

a. Forms of רא"ה and יר"א were frequently interchanged in Hebrew sources because of their similarity. These forms also must have puzzled translators on occasion. Thus, a homograph such as יראו required the translator to decide whether it is derived from the root *r'h* ("to see") or *yr'* ("to fear"), represented in the Tiberian vocalization as יִרְאוּ ("they will see" [*passim* in the Bible]), יָרְאוּ ("they feared" [*passim*]), or יִרְאוּ ("fear!" [e.g. Ps 34:10]). The same decision had to be made regarding וירא which may be derived from either *r'h* (וַיַּרְא ["and he saw"]) or *yr'* (וַיִּירָא = וַיִּרָא ["and he feared"]). Likewise, מורא ("terror"), an intrinsically

unproblematic word related to *yr'* ("to fear"), was often[11] linked by the LXX to the root *r'h* ("to see"):

Deut 4:34	ובמוראים
	καὶ ἐν ὁράμασιν (= V *visiones*, T^{OJ} חזנין)
Deut 26:8	ובמֹרָא
	καὶ ἐν ὁράμασιν (cf. T^{OJ}חזונא)
Jer 32 (39):21	ובמורא
	καὶ ἐν ὁράμασιν

Guided by the respective contexts,[12] the translators associated מ(ו)רא with the cluster **רא**, which they linked with *r'h* ("to see") rather than *yr'* ("to fear").

At the same time, it is hard to define a boundary between the etymological procedure described above, which does not involve the possibility of a variant reading, and the assumption of a variant reading as may be suggested by the reading ובמראים of SP in Deut 4:34 and ובמראה in the same text in Deut 26:8.[13]

The confusion between the two roots is also visible in the occasional translation of נורא as ἐπιφανής:

Hab 1:7	אֵ֥ימ וְנוֹרָ֖א הוּא
	([6]τὸ ἔθνος τὸ πικρὸν … τὸ πορευόμενον ἐπὶ τὰ πλάτη τῆς γῆς τοῦ κατακληρονομῆσαι σκηνώματα οὐκ αὐτοῦ) φοβερὸς καὶ ἐπιφανής ἐστιν

Within Habakkuk's harsh description of the enemy in 1:5–10 (11?), the Chaldeans are described in the LXX of v 7 as φοβερὸς καὶ ἐπιφανής. In this context it is understandable that the Chaldean people should be called φοβερός ("frightening," "terrible"), but what does the next word, ἐπιφανής, mean in this context? Are the people "conspicuous," "evident," or "famous"? Or should we rather take ἐπιφανής as the opposite of its main meaning, that is, "infamous"? However, the solution to this question lies in a different area. Against the sense of the passage, the translator derived נורא from ה"ראי, and somehow adapted the rendering to the context.

Joel 2:11	כי גדול יום יהוה ונורא מאד
	διότι μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, μεγάλη καὶ ἐπιφανὴς σφόδρα

[11] Contrast the derivation of מורא from *yr'* ("to fear") by the same translator in Deut 11:25 פחדכם ומוראכם יתן – τὸν τρόμον ὑμῶν καὶ τὸν φόβον ὑμῶν ἐπιθήσει and the appropriate equivalents יראה – τρόμος, φόβος occurring elsewhere in the LXX.

[12] E. g. Deut 4:34 וביד חזקה ובזרוע נטויה ובמוראים גדלים.

[13] Likewise, in the Passover Haggadah, מֹרָא גדל (Deut 26:8) is explained as the "revelation of God's presence," probably on the basis of מראה.

In this verse (cf. also 3:4), "the day of the Lord" is seemingly described as "glorious," but the real meaning of ἐπιφανής is "conspicuous," as the Hebrew was derived from ר"אה ("to see").[14]

b. The frequent translation of מועֵד (אהל) ("[tent] of meeting") on the basis of עֵד ("witness") as (ἡ σκήνη) τοῦ μαρτυρίου is based on its last two consonants,[15] although other verses were possibly echoed in the translators' ears.[16]

In the great majority of the instances described below, the biliteral exegesis pertains to weak verbs, such as the patterns א"פ, י"פ, etc. In some instances, however, such exegesis pertains to strong verbs, such as ד"מר ("to rebel") and המרמה ("deceit"), explained from מר ("bitter"), ם"כל ("to humiliate") explained from א"כל ("to prevent") through **כל**, דמן ("dung") explained from ה"דמ ("to resemble") through **דמ**, etc. In several examples below, a quiescent *ʾaleph* is involved.

The translators' biliteral renderings should be seen in the light of an internal analysis of the LXX, but Hebrew variations in MT and the Qumran scrolls, developments in rabbinic Hebrew, and medieval Jewish grammatical theories should be taken into consideration as well. These aspects will be analyzed in § 3.

In the following *non-exhaustive* collection of samples, the heading mentions in bold characters the two-letter basis for the exegesis, followed (from right to left) by (i) the root of the biblical word according to modern understanding and (ii) the root, letters, or word reflected by the LXX. Thus in the first example, נואש is a *niphʿal* form of יאש, but the translators derived the word from אנש/אישׁ. The two understandings have the letters **אש** in common.

אשׁ

יא"ש/אישׁ, אנש

Jer 2:25 נואשׁ (ותאמרי)
(But she said:) "Desperate"
ἀνδριοῦμαι
I will strengthen myself

In MT, the adulteress says: "Desperate. ('No, I love the strangers, and I must go after them')," while in the LXX she says: "I will strengthen myself (for she loved strangers, and went after them)." The translation of נואשׁ, which is based on אישׁ/אנש rather than יאשׁ, yields a completely different, though not necessarily impossible,

[14] The same rendering occurs in Judg 13:6A (as opposed to B φοβερόν), Mal 1:14, 3:22, Zeph 3:1, and 1 Chr 17:21. For an analysis of this rendering, see my study "Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings."

[15] Also when occurring alone, מועד has been rendered as μαρτύριον (1 Sam 9:24, 13:11 etc.).

[16] Both יע"ד and עו"ד are used in connection with the "tent of meeting" (see Exod 30:36). See further עדות (אהל) in Exod 30:36; Num 9:15, 17:22, 18:2.

meaning from that in MT.[17] In Jer 18:12 also, the Greek translation creates a new context opposed to that of MT:

Jer 18:12	נואש (ואמרו)
	But they will say: "It is no use."
	καὶ εἶπαν ἀνδριούμεθα
	But they said: "We will strengthen ourselves."

בר

ברבר/בר"ר

1 Kgs 5:3	וברברים אבוסים
	and fatted geese
(4:23)	… καὶ ὀρνίθων ἐκλεκτῶν σιτευτά
	and choice birds, fatted

ברבר (goose?), a *hapax legomenon* in the Bible, is derived here from בר"ר (cf. בר"(ר) – ἐκλέγω, ἐκλεκτός elsewhere in the LXX). Cf. also the next example of an equivalent occurring earlier in the same verse.

בריא/בר"(ר)

1 Kgs 5:3	ועשרה בקר בראִים
	and ten fattened oxen
(4:23)	καὶ δέκα μόσχοι ἐκλεκτοί
	and ten choice calves

בש

בא"ש/יב"ש

Isa 50:2	תבאש (דגתם מאין מים)
	(their fish) stink (because of lack of water)
	καὶ ξηρανθήσονται (= 1QIsa[a] תיבש)
	and (they) will dry out

In the LXX, in which the *'aleph* was conceived of as a mute letter, only the letters **בש** were taken into consideration. However, it is not impossible that the LXX reflects a different reading also found in 1QIsa[a].[18]

גר

גג"ר/אג"ר

Jer 18:21	והגרם (על ידי חרב)
	and mow them down (by the sword)

[17] The translators of 1 Sam 27:1, Isa 57:10, Job 6:26 identified נואש correctly.

[18] See Kutscher, *Language*, 241.

καὶ ἄθροισον αὐτούς
and assemble them

In rendering והגרם, only the middle two letters **גר** were taken as determinative for the identification, with the understanding that a quiescent *ʾaleph* was lost (i. e., והאגרם). The same phenomenon must have taken place in the next example in which the translator understood his *Vorlage* to read גָּרִים or מְגָרִים reflecting his understanding גרים(א)(מ).

מגור (גו"ר)/אג"ר

Jer 20:10 (שמעתי דבת רבים) מגור (מסביב)
(I heard the whispers of the crowd –) terror (all around)
συναθροιζομένων
of those who assemble

דמ

דמן/דמ"ה

Jer 8:2 לדמן (על פני האדמה יהיו)
(they shall become) dung (upon the face of the earth)
εἰς παράδειγμα
an example

This rendering, based on the root דמ"ה, recurs in Jer 9:22 (21); 16:4. For the same equivalent, see Dan 2:5. Cf. Ps 17:12 דמינו, rendered by Aquila as ὁμοίωσις αὐτῶν (reconstructed from Syh דומיא דילהון).

חל

חל"ה/חל"ל

Mic 1:12 חלה (לטוב יושבת מרות)
(the inhabitant[s] of Maroth) hoped for (good)
τίς ἤρξατο
who started?

חי"ל/חל"ל

Ps 10:5 יחילו (דרכיו בכל עת)
(his ways) prosper (at all times)
(9:26) βεβηλοῦνται
are defiled

The various confusions of renderings of the חל group in the LXX have been analyzed extensively by Weissert.[19] In the examples listed here, the translators created completely new contexts differing from those of MT. See further below, n. 28.

חס

מחסה (חס"ה)/חו"ס

Jer 17:17	(מחסי אתה (ביום רעה you are my refuge (in a day of calamity) φειδόμενός μου … sparing me
Joel 4:16	(לעמו) מחסה (ויהוה) (and the Lord) will be a shelter (to his people) φείσεται he will be merciful

Although the roots חו"ס and חס"ה are semantically close to one another, they represent different ideas. φείδομαι usually reflects forms of חו"ס.

יר

הורה/אור

In two verses in 2 Kings, forms of הורה ("to instruct") have been rendered as if related to אור ("light"): 2 Kgs 12:3 הורהו and 17:27, 28 וירם, מורה (in all three cases: φωτίζω based on אור – φῶς *passim* in the LXX).[20] Likewise, in Hab 2:18, 19 מורה and יורה were rendered as φαντασία as if from אור. The etymological interpretation behind these renderings should be compared with the textual variation between (משפטיך) יורו in MT Deut 33:10 and 4QTest (4Q175) 17 ויאירו[21] and likewise ויורהו (MT) and ויראהו (SP, LXX, S, T, V) in Exod 15:25. These examples show that the boundary between etymological exegesis and the assumption or presence of a variant is very subtle.

[19] D. Weissert, "Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques – A Case Study of חלל–חיל–חול," *Textus* 8 (1974) 31–44.

[20] The three renderings occur in sections ascribed to *kaige*-Th, and similar renderings occur *passim* in Aquila's translation that was based on *kaige*-Th. See M. Smith, "Another Criterion for the καίγε Recension," *Bib* 48 (1967) 443–5.

[21] First publication: J. M. Allegro, *DJD* V, 57–60. Cf. 4QpIsa[d] (4Q164) 5 כמשפט מאירים.

כל[22]

כל"ם/כל"ה

1 Sam 20:34 (אביו) הִכְלִמוֹ
(his father) had humiliated him
συνετέλεσεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν
he had completed upon him

כל"ם/כל"א

1 Sam 25:7 הָכְלַמְנוּם
we humiliated them
ἀπεκωλύσαμεν αὐτούς
we prevented them

1 Sam 25:15 לֹא הָכְלַמְנוּ
we were not humiliated
οὐκ ἀπεκώλυσαν ἡμᾶς
they did not prevent us

The Greek translation created contexts completely different from those in MT.

כי"ל, כו"ל/כל"ל

Jer 6:11 נלאיתי הכיל
I cannot hold it in
καὶ ἐπέσχον καὶ οὐ συνετέλεσα αὐτούς
and I held (it) and I did not complete them

Ezek 23:32 להכיל (מרבה)
it holds (so much)
τοῦ συντελέσαι
to complete

כל"ה/אכ"ל

Hab 3:17 (צאן) ממכלה (גֶּדֶר)
(the flock was cut off from) the sheepfold
(ἐξέλιπον) ἀπὸ βρώσεως (πρόβατα)
from the food

2 Chr 30:22 ויאכלו (את המועד)
they ate the (food of the festival)
καὶ συνετέλεσαν
and they completed

[22] On the confusion of *kol* and *kalah* in the LXX, see F.H. Polak, "The Interpretation of כָּלָה/כְּלָה in the LXX: Ambiguity and Intuitive Comprehension," *Textus* 17 (1994) 57–77.

In all these cases, the Greek translation created contexts completely different from those in MT.

The translator of Habakkuk derived מכלה from אכ"ל. For a similar rendering, see Isa 3:6 והמכשלה הזאת – τὸ βρῶμα ἐμόν (my food). The wording of this verse in Greek has much in common with the next one, and may have been influenced by it; at the same time, the translator of Isaiah may have had the root אכ"ל in mind (cf. 1 Kgs 5:25 מכלת "food").

מר

מר"ה/מר"(ר)

Deut 31:27 ממרים היתם עם יהוה
you have been rebellious against the Lord
παραπικραίνοντες ἦτε πρὸς τὸν θεόν
you have been embittering (in your conduct) toward God

Words of the מר"ה group have *often* been rendered as παραπικραίνω ("to embitter"), a verb that is related to the adjective πικρός "bitter" (usually reflecting מר). This frequent LXX equivalence was apparently influenced by its first occurrence in the Greek Pentateuch, in the present verse.[23]

מר"ד/מר"(ר)

Ezek 2:3 אל בני ישראל (אל גוים) המורדים אשר מרדו בי
… to nations of rebels who have rebelled against me
πρὸς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ισραηλ τοὺς παραπικραίνοντάς με
to the house of Israel, them that embitter me

This example transcends the boundaries of the group of weak verbs.

מרמה/מר"(ר)

Ps 10:7 אלה פיהו מלא ומרמות ותך
his mouth is filled with cursing, deceit, and oppression
(9:28) οὗ ἀρᾶς τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ γέμει καὶ πικρίας καὶ δόλου
whose mouth is full of cursing, and bitterness, and fraud

נח

נח"ם/נח"ה/נו"ח

These three roots have different base meanings (נח"ם = "to comfort, relent," נח"ה = "to lead," and נו"ח = "to rest"), yet in the translations they are often interchanged

[23] See Tov, "Pentateuch." See further the thorough discussion of this word by Walters, *Text*, 150–53 as well as earlier studies: M. Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter," *ZAW* 32 (1912) 185–9; R. Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928) 101–3.

because of their similarity, sometimes producing homographic forms (הנחם actually produced forms from all three roots in the various witnesses, as in 1 Sam 22:4; 1 Kgs 10:26; 2 Kgs 18:11; Prov 11:3). The close relationship between the roots is evident already in the MT of Genesis, where the name of Noah is explained from נח"ם (Gen 5:29). The present study focuses on forms that are derived from one of the three roots, but are rendered by another one.

Isa 1:24 הוי אנחם מצרי
Ah, I will get satisfaction from my foes (NJPST)
οὐ παύσεται γάρ μου ὁ θυμὸς ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις
For my wrath shall not cease against my adversaries

παύομαι (to cease) and its composita frequently reflect נו"ח in the LXX. נח"ם is also rendered as παύομαι in Jer 26 (33):3, 13, 19; 31 (38):15; 42 (49):10.

Isa 63:14 רוח יהוה תניחנו
the spirit of the Lord gave them rest
πνεῦμα παρὰ κυρίου. καὶ ὡδήγησεν αὐτούς
the spirit from the Lord, and guided them (תַּנְחֵנּו)

נמ
נא"ם/נו"ם

Jer 23:31 הנני על הנביאם (… הלקחים לשונם וינאמו נאם)
(Behold, I am against the prophets …), who use their tongue and deliver a speech
LXX[88 *L' La-w*] τοὺς ἐκλαμβάνοντας (LXX[rel] ἐκβάλλοντας) προφητείας γλώσσης καὶ νυστάζοντας νυσταγμὸν αὐτῶν
… who put forth prophecies of (their) tongue and slumber their sleep

The translator derived וינאמו נאם from נו"ם ("to slumber"), as if the text read וינומו נום, for which cf. the frequent spelling of נאם in 1QIsa[a] as נום/נאום/נואם (cf. Kutscher, *Language*, 498–500).

ספ
יס"ף/אס"ף

Jer 7:21 (עלותיכם) (ספו (על זבחיהם)
add (your burnt offerings to your other sacrifices)
συναγάγετε
assemble

Isa 29:1 (ספו (שנה על שנה
add (year to year)

συναγάγετε (γενήματα ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπ᾽ ἐνιαυτόν)
assemble (produce year by year)

To these renderings, cf. the interchange MT ואספה/1QIsa[a] ויספה in Isa 37:31 (see Kutscher, *Language*, 220).

סף"ה/אס"ף

Isa 13:15 (וכל הנספה (יפול בחרב
(whoever) is caught (will fall by the sword)
καὶ οἵτινες συνηγμένοι εἰσίν (similarly S דנתתוסף)
and all the assembled

אס"ף/סו"ף

Exod 23:16 (וחג האסיף (בצאת השנה) באספך (את מעשיך מן השדה
(you shall observe) the Festival of Ingathering (at the end of the year), when you gather in (from the field the fruit of your labor)
καὶ ἑορτὴν συντελείας (ἐπ᾽ ἐξόδου τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ) ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ (τῶν ἔργων σου τῶν ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ σου)
… and the Feast of Finishing (at the end of the year) in the gathering in (of your fruits out of your field).

Lev 23:39 באספכם (את תבואת הארץ)
when you have gathered (the yield of the land)
ὅταν συντελέσητε τὰ γενήματα τῆς γῆς
when you have completed (the fruits of the land)

The context in Exodus (בצאת השנה, "at the end of the year") probably influenced the present rendering involving the representation of האסיף on the basis of סו"ף. Interestingly enough, the translator rendered the root אס"ף twice differently in this verse.

The following two examples illustrate the complexity of the renderings of the **סף** group involving the representation of יס"ף as אס"ף in MT:

אס"ף/יס"ף

Exod 5:7 לא תאספון לתת
you shall not continue to give
οὐκέτι προστεθήσεται διδόναι
you shall no longer give

The translator rightly derived תאספון from יס"ף (see BDB, p. 415).

יס"ף/אס"ף

2 Sam 6:1 ויסף עוד דוד את כל בחור

(David) again gathered (all the chosen men)
καὶ συνήγαγεν ἔτι (Δαυιδ πάντα νεανίαν)
(David) again gathered (every young man)

The translator rightly derived ויסף from אס"ף. Cf. Ps 104:29 MT תסף and 1QpHab V 14 ויספהו reflecting Hab 1:15 ויאספהו (he gathered them).

The following examples show the interaction between סו"ף and אס"ף within MT. Formally speaking, the second words in both examples are derived from סו"ף, but the biblical authors artistically combined the two roots (see further § 3 below). The translator of Jeremiah derived the two forms from אס"ף, while in Zephaniah the two forms were derived from סו"ף (probably by the same translator).

Jer 8:13 אָסֹף אסיפם
I will make an end of them
καὶ συνάξουσι (τὰ γενήματα αὐτῶν)
and they will collect (their produce)

Zeph 1:2 (כל) אָסֹף אָסֵף
I will sweep (everything) away
ἐκλείψει ἐκλιπέτω (πάντα)
he must abandon (everything) completely

פצ
פו"ץ/נפ"ץ

Jer 23:1 … ומפצים את צאן מרעיתי
… and who scatter the sheep of my pasture
καὶ ἀπολλύοντες τὰ πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς μου
… and who destroy the sheep of my pasture

Ezek 34:21 (אותנה) אשר הפיצותם
until you scattered (them)
καὶ ἐξέθλιβετε
and you cruelly treated

Both Greek translations, based on נפ"ץ, present a context differing from that of MT. A reverse picture is reflected in the following renderings of נפ"ץ, which are based on פו"ץ.

Jer 51:20 מפץ אתה לי … ונפצתי
you are my war club … and I will smash
(28:20) διασκορπίζεις σύ μοι … καὶ διασκορπιῶ
you are scattering for me … and I will scatter

For similar renderings, see Jer 13:14, 51(28):21, 22, 23, as well as Dan 12:7 Th.

צר

נצ"ר/צר"ר

Jer 4:16 (באים) נצרים
watchers (come)
συστροφαί cf. S כנשא דעממא
bands/crowds

For the translation equivalent, cf. צר"ר – συστροφή in Hos 4:19, 13:12; Prov 30:4.[24]

נצ"ר/יצ"ר

Prov 24:12 ונצר נפשך
He who keeps watch over your soul
ὁ πλάσας πνοήν
he that formed breath

קנ

קנ"א/קנ"ה

Isa 11:11 (יוסיף אדני שנית ידו) לקנות (את שאר עמו)
(the Lord will extend his hand yet a second time) to redeem (the remnant of his people)
τοῦ ζηλῶσαι
to be zealous for

The translator derived לקנות ("to acquire") from קנ"א ("to be zealous") (cf. v 13 יקנא – ζηλώσει). For the close connection between forms of the two roots, see the artistic use in Ezek 8:3 סמל הקנאה המקנה. See further § 3 below.

רא

מורא, נורא/רא"ה

See above, § 2.

רע

רע"ע/רע"ה

Ps 2:9 (בשבט ברזל) תרׇעם
You shall break them (with a rod of iron)
ποιμανεῖς αὐτούς = S תרעא אנון
You shall shepherd them

[24] See the analysis by C. Rabin, "Noṣrim," *Textus* 5 (1966) 44–52.

תרעם of MT fits the parallel stich (ככלי יוצר תנפצם, "you will dash them in pieces as a potter's wheel"), and hence the understanding of the Greek translator, possibly influenced by Mic 7:14 רעה עמך בשבטך,[25] is inappropriate.

רשׁ

יר"ש/ רו/אש

Jer 49:2	את יְרָשָׁיו (וירש ישראל)
	(and Israel shall dispossess) those who dispossessed him
(30:2)	τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ
	its government

שׁב

שב"ב/יש"ב

Jer 3:6, 8, 12	משׁ(ו)בה ישראל
	that faithless one, Israel
	ἡ κατοικία τοῦ Ισραηλ
	the house of Israel
	similarly: Hos 11:7; 14:5

The Greek rendering, based on יש"ב (cf. the translation of מושב with κατοικία in Ezek 34:13), is unusual, since there is no apparent reason in the context for this understanding. Elsewhere in Jeremiah, משובה is rendered from שב"ב (Jer 2:19; 3:11, 22) or שו"ב (see the next item). The combination of a noun from the root יש"ב and ישראל occurs in Exod 12:40.

שב"ב/שו"ב

Jer 8:5	שובבה … משבה (נצחת)
	is rebellious … (with perpetual) rebellion
	ἀ᾽πέστρεψεν … ἀποστροφήν
	turned away … turning away

The same rendering recurs in Jer 5:6.

שו"ב/יש"ב

Ezek 29:14	וְהֲשִׁבֹתִי אתם
	I will bring them back
	καὶ κατοικίσω αὐτούς
	I will cause them to dwell

For the closeness of שו"ב and יש"ב, see Jer 42:10 שוב תשבו (see also § 3 below).

[25] Suggestion by N. Mizrahi.

שׁמ
אש"ם/שׁמ"ם

Hos 10:2 יאשמו
they must bear their guilt
ἀφανισθήσονται
they will be destroyed

This translation recurs in Hos 14:1 and Joel 1:18. See also Isa 24:6 T; Ezek 6:6 (cf. Sym, S, T); Ps 34:22 (cf. S).

שׁנ
שׁאנ"ן /ישׁ"ן

Jer 46:27 (ושׁקט ושׁאנן (ואין מחריד
And he will have calm and quiet (and no one shall trouble him)
(26:27) καὶ ἡσυχάσει καὶ ὑπνώσει
And he will have calm and will sleep

The Greek translation of ושׁאנן is probably based on an assumed connection between ושׁאנן (ישׁאנן?) and ישׁ"ן ("to sleep") involving a quiescent *ʾaleph*.

שׁר
שׁר"ר/ישׁ"ר

Jer 9:13 וילכו אחרי שׁררות לבם
who stubbornly follow their own will
ἀλλ᾽ ἐπορεύθησαν ὀπίσω τῶν ἀρεστῶν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν τῆς κακῆς
but they went after the pleasing things of their evil heart

The Greek translation is based on the equivalence ישׁר – ἀρεστ-, occurring often in the LXX (Exod 15:26; Deut 6:18; 12:8, 25, 28 etc.). The same rendering recurs in Jer 16:12; 18:12.[26]

Jer 15:11 K אם לא שׁרותך (Q שׁריתיך)
I have surely set you free (K)
κατευθυνόντων αὐτῶν
while they succeed

The verb κατευθύνω often renders words from the root ישׁ"ר (Ps 5:8; Prov 1:3; 9:15, etc.).

[26] For the same etymological derivation, see Sym in Jer 11:8 ἀρεσκεία; Th in Jer 11:8; 13:10 εὐθύτης.

3. Some Conclusions

The data adduced in this study illustrate several aspects of the translators' etymological exegesis, especially their turning to clusters of two letters that provide the minimal information needed for semantic identification. This technique was employed in the case of several weak verbs as well as a few strong verbs, but it is hard to know how widespread this procedure was since it comes to light only from the recognition of occasional errors in identification. The cases illustrated here show that for some verbs a cluster of two letters could suffice for semantic identification, but if that cluster was the key for two *different* verbs, mishaps could occur as in the case of **רא** pointing to both ר"אה and ר"אי.

Renderings of this type do not necessitate the assumption that the translators adhered to a biliteral root theory.[27] Nor is there sufficient evidence for assuming that the translators' Hebrew "word-analysis" was influenced by a comparison with the Greek verbal system, as analyzed by Alexandrian grammarians.[28]

These renderings probably reflect unsystematic *ad hoc* exegesis in the identification process. The translators experienced many difficulties in analyzing Hebrew forms, so that by necessity they sometimes turned to improvisations. Similar improvisations are visible in the renderings described in n. 1 as well as some partial translations (sometimes some of the letters of the word in the *Vorlage* were disregarded in the translation because the translator did not know how to render them).[29]

The assumption that the translators based themselves on the close relationship between certain roots may be supported by the way this closeness was regarded in Scripture itself. Some biblical authors "played on" these related roots.[30] Thus two prophets (Jer 8:13; Zeph 1:2) skillfully combined סו"ף and אס"ף (see above) as well as שו"ב and יש"ב (Jer 42:10 שוב תשבו), etc.

The close proximity between the weak verbs sometimes created a mixture of verbal forms that was part and parcel of Biblical Hebrew (BH). Thus פ"י forms were sometimes mixed with ע"וי (for example, יט"ב/טו"ב), פ"נ forms with ע"וי (נפ"ץ/פו"ץ, מו"ל next to מל"ל/נמ"ל Gen 17:11), ע"ע forms with ע"וי (for example,

[27] Besides, the translators created identical meanings for different roots, while at the root of biliteral exegesis lies the assumption of different, though slightly similar, Hebrew roots sharing two of the three consonants, such as פר"ה, פר"צ, פר"ס, פר"ש, פר"ר, פל"ח, פל"ג, פר"ר.

[28] Thus Weissert (see n. 19). This attractive theory would be even more attractive if it could be proven that the translators compared Hebrew linguistic phenomena with equivalent Greek features in other aspects also. The theory assumes sophistication from the side of the translators, whereas perhaps ignorance and lack of experience guided their actions (see the examples in this paper and see Tov, "Septuagint Translators"). Further, Weissert's assumed rules of analogy used in the various translation units in the LXX are problematic as they presuppose either unity of translation or constant interaction between the translators.

[29] See n. 2.

[30] The phrase is used by Sperber, *Historical Grammar*, 596, who provided many examples, not all of them relevant.

מו"ש/מש"ש), and verbs א"ל with י"ל.[31] As a result, the school-type distinction between the verb patterns often can no longer be upheld. Thus הובשת in 2 Sam 19:6 (and elsewhere) reflects ש"בו, not ש"יב, rightly translated as "you have humiliated" in the translations, including the LXX.[32] All these phenomena are recorded in the lexicons and grammars.[33]

These developments were accelerated in MH, resulting in greater contamination. There are new ע"ו forms next to פ"י (for example, יק"ין/קו"ין, יג"ק/נו"ק), there are new instances of ע"ע forms next to ע"ו (for example, זל"ל/זו"ל), and there is additional assimilation between א"ל and י"ל forms. All these phenomena are well illustrated in the grammars.[34]

Since mixture and confusion between various word patterns frequently took place in BH and MH, it is not surprising that similar manuscript variations were created in all periods. Some of these manuscript variations were mentioned above, occasionally coinciding with the LXX. Thus, for Isa 50:2 (דגתם מאין מים) תבאש, the reading of the LXX καὶ ξηρανθήσονται may be based on 1QIsa[a] תיבש. The interchanges between MT ואספה/1QIsa[a] ויספה in Isa 37:31 and between MT Hab 1:15 ויאספהו (he gathered them)/1QpHab V 14 ויספהו parallel the פ"א/פ"י interchanges between the LXX and MT recorded above (**סף** group). In addition, the detailed description by Kutscher, *Language* of 1QIsa[a] provides ample illustration of the interchanges of weak verbal forms between MT and the scroll unrelated to the LXX (e. g., נח"ל/יח"ל [p. 265], יס"ר/סו"ר [p. 268], סר"ר/סר"ה [p. 269]).

The translators may have been aware of these phenomena and developments. However, we should be very careful not to ascribe refined grammatical understanding to the translators, since lack of linguistic understanding is widespread. Furthermore, there is a very basic difference between the translators' exegesis and the developments taking place in the Hebrew language. The developments within the language took place in a natural way, without distorting the message of the texts or the meanings of words. Thus when a א"ל form was represented in Ezek 8:3 as a י"ל form (סמל הקנאה המקנה), it nevertheless carried the meaning of א"קנ; the reader probably understood the author. However, when the LXX of

---

[31] See Gesenius–Kautzsch, *Grammar*, § 75 qq–rr and Ezek 8:3 הקנאה המקנה (סמל) quoted above (where the second word, formally reflecting ה"קנ, carries the meaning of א"קנ). In fact, according to Sperber, *Historical Grammar*, 595, these two patterns form one rather than two groups.

[32] Likewise, in 2 Sam 6:1 ויסף, what looks like a פ"י form actually represents ויאסף through the omission of the quiescent *'aleph*, and reversely in Exod 5:7 where what appears to be a פ"א form לא תאספון actually represents תוספון.

[33] See, for example, Gesenius–Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar,* ibid.

[34] See M. H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1927) §§ 185, 189; G. Haneman, *A Morphology of Mishnaic Hebrew According to the Tradition of the Parma Manuscript (De-Rossi 138)* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 3; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1980), esp. 422–31.

Isa 11:11 rendered לקנות according to the ל"א pattern, he created a completely different meaning and context.[35] It would therefore be hard to describe this development as natural, and would probably be closer to the truth to consider this and most of the renderings recorded here as reflecting lack of linguistic refinement.[36] We therefore noted sometimes that the translator created a completely new context.

In sum, the LXX translators, as other biblical translators in antiquity,[37] often turned to a *cluster* of two letters providing sufficient information for the translation process, especially in weak verbal forms. This approach was borne out of the translators' difficulties in identifying words, rather than any biliteral theory.[38] Such a theory was developed much later by some medieval Jewish grammarians,[39] and revived in the scholarly literature from the eighteenth century onwards.[40]

---

[35] Therefore, in his summarizing remarks on the interchanges between roots in MT and 1QIsa[a], Kutscher (*Language*, 296–315) probably reads too much into the external similarities between this scroll and the versions: "… the Versions make use of the same methods as the Scr." (306) … In all these instances, the exegesis of one or another of the medieval Jewish commentators – who of course read = MT – is in accord with the 'emendation' of the versions and the Scr.'s reading. (306) … Actually, the Versions are of great value to us for a different reason: they help us to understand what the Scr.'s scribe had in mind when he changed the text" (308).

[36] At the same time, some of the renderings may have been influenced by phonetic developments, as in the cases of כפ, גר, and נמ (suggestion by N. Mizrahi).

[37] For some examples from the Targumim, see Prijs, *Tradition*, 83, n. 3. For the Peshitta, see Ch. Heller, *Untersuchungen über die Peschitta zur gesamten hebräischen Bibel* I (Berlin: Poppelauer, 1911) 45–7.

[38] Another view was espoused by G. R. Driver, "Confused Hebrew Roots," in *Occident and Orient … Gaster Anniversary Volume* (ed. B. Schindler; London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1936) 73–83. According to Driver, it was not the translator who sometimes mistakenly derived a verbal form from a closely related root, but the roots themselves were closely related. Thus Driver believes that אב"ל, "was dried up, mourned," נב"ל, "dropped, faded, languished," and perhaps also בל"ה, "was worn out, wasted away," were "cognate roots developed from *bl* as a common base," (ibid., p. 75), as, e. g. in Jer 12:4 עד מתי תאבל הארץ ועשב כל השדה ייבש where אב"ל should be taken as "was dried up" as in T תחרוב. According to Driver, this claim is supported by the versions, in which, in another instance, forms of אש"ם are rendered as if from שמ"ם (see the examples above), both deriving from a common root שמ"ם = אש"ם. Regardless of the merits of Driver's speculation, support from the versions is very questionable.

[39] Menahem Ibn Saruq (10th century) and Judah ben David Hayyuj (*c.* 945–1000). In the prologue to his lexicon, the *Maḥberet*, Menahem Ibn Saruq developed the theory that all triliteral roots were ultimately biliteral, even uniliteral. See the editions of H. Filipowskius, *Antiquissimum linguae hebraicae et chaldaecae lexicon ad sacras scripturas explicandas A Menahem Ben Saruck hispaniensis …* (London/Edinburgh: Typis H. Filipowskius, 1854) and A. Saenz Badillos, *Mahberet / Menahem Ben Saruq; edicíon crítica* (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1986); see also Y. Blau, "Menahem ben Jacob Ibn Saruq," *EncJud* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971) 11:1305–6.

[40] For an analysis and bibliography, see S. Moscati, "Il biconsonantismo nelle lingue semitiche," *Bib* 28 (1947) 113–35; G. J. Botterweck, *Der Triliterismus im Semitischen erläutert an den Wurzeln GL KL KL* (BBB 3; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1952) 11–30; *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages, Phonology and Morphology* (ed. S. Moscati; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1969) 72–5. See further Gesenius–Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, § 30 f–o.

Chapter Twenty-Six

The Septuagint and the Deuteronomists*

The hypothesis that some of the books of Hebrew Scripture were reworked by (a) Deuteronomistic (Dtr) reviser(s) is well established and has been accepted, with several variations, by virtually all critical Bible scholars. Thus, some scholars assume that earlier forms of Joshua–2 Kings and Jeremiah[1] were revised in the spirit of Deuteronomy, while others claim that the "Deuteronomists" themselves edited the books.[2] This reworking involved the reformulating and re-editing of an earlier text in light of the ideas and wording of Deuteronomy. This altering of a biblical book on the basis of Deuteronomy differs from a biblical author's intimate knowledge of that book, as has been claimed, for example, for Jeremiah's close connection to Deuteronomy. In any event, it should be noted that all details relating to the Dtr hypothesis are contested (number of revisers; date of the revision(s); methods used; books revised; vocabulary of Dtr; ideology of the reworking; relation to Deuteronomy, etc.).[3] The scholarly assumption of a Dtr

* Thanks are due to Mindy Anderson Jeppesen for her careful reading of the manuscript and her helpful remarks.

[1] The hypotheses relating to the existence of Dtr elements in additional books are not well founded. Furthermore, they are also irrelevant to the present investigation, since in these cases the evidence is limited to MT and is not challenged by other textual witnesses. A Dtr reworking of Amos is often mentioned in the literature; see, for example, R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Theologische Wissenschaft 1; Stuttgart/Berlin/ Cologne/Mainz: Kohlhammer, 1978) 175. This assumption was refuted by S. M. Paul, "A Literary Reinvestigation of the Authenticity of the Oracles against the Nations of Amos," in *De la Tôrah au Messie: Études d'exégèse et d'hermémeutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles* (ed. J. Doré et al.; Paris: Desclée, 1981) 189–204 = idem, *Divrei Shalom, Collected Studies of Shalom M. Paul on the Bible and the Ancient Near East 1967–2005* (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2005) 417–37. A Dtr reworking of Zechariah was suggested by R. F. Person, *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School* (JSOTSup 167; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).

[2] See n. 71 relating to Jeremiah.

[3] For some of the latest literature, see M. A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis, A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989); L. S. Schearing and S. L. McKenzie, *Those Elusive Deuteronomists, The Phenomenon of Pan-Deuteronomism* (JSOTSup 268; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); *Israel Constructs Its History, Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (ed. A. de Pury et al.; JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); A. F. Campbell, S. J. and M. A. O'Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History, Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000); *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (ed. T. Römer; BETL 14; Leuven: Peeters, 2000); G. N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville, *Reconsidering Israel and Judah–Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 8; Winona Lake, Ind.:

reworking in Joshua–2 Kings and Jeremiah is based mainly on the evidence of MT, since in most details relating to a possible Deuteronomistic revision, MT agrees with the other textual witnesses. Among these non-Masoretic witnesses, the LXX is the oldest, dating to the third and second pre-Christian centuries. It is usually assumed that the Dtr reworking was completed long before the creation of the LXX translation, and it therefore stands to reason that this version would reflect little evidence of Dtr activity.

However, this study deals with a substantial number of discrepancies relating to this understanding. It refers to instances in which evidence possibly relating to Dtr is *not* shared by all textual sources. In most of these instances, Dtr phrases in MT are not reflected in the LXX, while in a few cases the LXX provides Dtr evidence not extant in MT. The data are discussed book by book since the textual evidence and content dynamics differ in each book. One of the main points of interest is the question of whether the addition or omission of a Dtr phrase took place in the course of scribal transmission or during one of the compositional stages. In the former scenario, scribal changes are irrelevant to literary procedures. In the latter case, relating to the composition of books, we need to ask ourselves whether the Dtr details added or omitted in one of the textual sources reflect occasional changes by an editor or were part of a systematic attempt to revise the book as a whole. All additions and omissions of Dtr elements in one of the textual sources (with the exclusion of Joshua 20) were applied to an already existing layer of Dtr revision, and therefore the possibility of a second layer of Dtr revision is invoked. An analysis of the MT of Joshua–2 Kings and Jeremiah shows that the assumption of a Dtr revision is rather stable, but the evidence from the LXX may suggest that this layer actually consists of two segments. We say, "*may* suggest," since this evidence will be analyzed below. Further, if such a second Dtr layer is detected, we need to ask ourselves whether these two textual strata in Dtr[4] represent the same layers that scholars detected in the Dtr revision of the historical books without reference to textual evidence.[5]

Eisenbrauns, 2000); T. Römer, *The So-called Deuteronomistic History*, *A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T & T Clark, 2005); *Die deuteronomistische Geschichtswerke*, *Redaktions- und religionsgeschichtliche Perspektiven zur "Deuteronomismus"-Diskussion im Tora und Vorderen Propheten* (ed. J. C. Gertz, K. Schmid, and M. Witte; BZAW 365, 2006).

[4] The main proponent of such a view is Person; see the monographs mentioned in notes 1 and 79. See especially Person, *Second Zechariah*, 43–54. Not all examples quoted by him are relevant since some of the quoted differences between textual layers refer to phrases that are not Deuteronomistic.

[5] Such views have been expressed since the days of Ewald in the nineteenth century, culminating in the "Double Dtr Redaction" as phrased by what is named the schools of Cross and Smend. These views have been summarized by T. Römer and A. de Pury, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," 63–74. See F. M. Cross, "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," in his *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973) 274–89; R. Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte," in *Probleme biblischer Theologie: G. von Rad*

The analysis is tentative because of the accumulation of several assumptions:

a. The use of details in the LXX in the exegesis of the Hebrew Bible remains uncertain. Even if the Greek evidence is seemingly unproblematic, as in the case of a short LXX reading in contrast to a long one in MT, the reconstruction of a short Hebrew text on the basis of the LXX remains subjective. In each instance, we vacillate between the possibility of a translator inserting the change himself (in this case, abbreviating his *Vorlage*) and that of a short Hebrew text faithfully rendered into Greek. Accordingly, for each book, we must first address the faithfulness of the translator to his *Vorlage*. Thus, the evidence of the LXX may be trusted if the translation technique is faithful to the underlying Hebrew text.[6] For example, the literal approach in 1 Kings and Jeremiah allows for the assumption that the lack of the Dtr phrases in these books points to a short Hebrew *Vorlage*.

b. The decision as to whether a certain phrase reflects Dtr vocabulary remains uncertain, as shown, for example, by the discussion below of 1 Kings 6. While old assumptions need not be re-examined time and again, one should be aware of the uncertainty of the procedure. Constant reference is made to lists of Dtr phraseology, especially M. Weinfeld's, which relates to all the Dtr books, and that of Stulman for Jeremiah,[7] but the characterization of a phrase as Dtr on the basis of these lists is not without problems.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relevance of the textual data for the study of Dtr. The discussion is limited to the LXX since there is no significant evidence known to us from the other textual sources.[8] For each relevant detail in the LXX, we envisage the following three options:

a. The difference between the LXX and MT is irrelevant to the textual and literary analysis of the Hebrew Bible because it was created by the *translator*.

b. The Dtr element was created by a Hebrew *copyist* in the course of the textual transmission.

---

zum 70. Geburtstag (ed. H.W. Wolff; Munich: C. Kaiser Verlag, 1971) 494–509; R.D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1981).

[6] For an analysis, see *TCU*, 37–89.

[7] M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 320–61; L. Stulman, *The Prose Sermons of the Book of Jeremiah. A Redescription of the Correspondences with Deuteronomistic Literature in Light of Recent Text-Critical Research* (SBLDS 83; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 33–44. The phrases in Weinfeld's list are subdivided into content categories, while the categorization in Stulman's list follows statistical criteria. The logic behind the analysis of Dtr phraseology is based on a combination of arguments: context (a phrase, verse, or paragraph is inappropriate in the context), the distinction between poetry and prose (in Jeremiah), and word distribution in Hebrew Scripture as a whole. The latter argument is based on the observation that a given phrase occurs in Hebrew Scripture mainly in the book of Deuteronomy and/or the Dtr layer in Joshua, Judges, etc.

[8] A possible exception pertains to 4QJudg[a], which lacks a complete paragraph, Judg 6:7–10. The absence of this paragraph was explained as pointing to a pre-Dtr text. See chapter 11*, n. 44.

c. The Dtr element was created or omitted by a late editor during the continual process of change of the literary shape of the Hebrew book. This process took place either in the forerunner of MT (in the case of a minus in the LXX) or in the parent text of the LXX (in the case of a plus in the LXX).

The analysis refers to those instances known to us in which either MT or the LXX contains a Dtr phrase that is not shared by the other source. In all instances, some or most scholars point to the Dtr nature of one of the phrases (usually minuses of the LXX). Most English translations of the Hebrew phrases or verses follow the NJPS translation.[9]

Joshua

The LXX of Joshua reflects three types of minuses of Dtr phrases vis-à-vis MT, (1a) single Dtr phrases, (1b) a quotation from Deuteronomy, and (1c) a passage revised according to Deuteronomy. The LXX also reflects some pluses based on Deuteronomy (2). Most Dtr phrases were probably inserted in MT (groups 1a–b) and the LXX (group 2) by a scribe at a late stage in the transmission of the book, while the item in group 1c attests to changes made during one of the compositional stages. This item should be viewed in the light of other major differences between the Greek and Hebrew forms of the book that show evidence of early features in both texts.[10]

The instances listed below are presented as if the translator found a different text in front of him. However, this way of presenting the material shows more confidence than is merited in the case of Joshua. The translator could have shortened his text since the translation technique argument is indecisive in this book. On the other hand, in our view, the translation is not sufficiently free to allow for the assumption that the translator left out the details listed below.[11] More likely, he found an often-shorter text.

---

[9] תנך, *JPS Hebrew–English Tanakh: The Traditional Hebrew Text and the New JPS Translation* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: JPS, 1999).

[10] See my paper "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation," *ScrHier* 31 (1986) 321–9 with references to earlier studies. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 385–96.

[11] See the analysis of the translation technique in Mazor (below); C. G. den Hartog, *Studien zur griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua*, Ph.D. diss., University of Giessen, 1996, 160–83; J. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth* (Moers: J. G. Eckner, 1876) 5–9. On the basis of limited data provided in Tov, "The Growth," 388, n. 13, the translation was ranked as relatively free to relatively literal. At the same time, the freedom of the translator is often predictable, so that the reconstruction of its Hebrew base text is often easier than shown by mere statistics. See further the conclusion of R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF, Diss. Hum. Litt. 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979) 285, who includes Joshua in the second of four groups (relatively free), together with Leviticus, Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. Further arguments in

1a. Single Dtr phrases lacking in the LXX

Several Dtr phrases in Joshua are not reflected in the LXX.[12] The text quoted below is that of MT with the LXX deviations indicated by parenthesis or italics.

1:1 After the death of Moses (the servant of the Lord); in 1:15; 12:6b; 22:4 the LXX lacks the same phrase.[13] Driver lists the phrase as Dtr,[14] while Weinfeld, 351, does not mention it. Instead, Weinfeld records the related phrase עבד את יהוה as Dtr.[15] The phrase is also used for Moses in the MT and LXX of Deut 34:5; 2 Kgs 18:12; 2 Chr 1:3, 24:6 (LXX: ἀνθρώπου τοῦ θεοῦ), and before Dtr also in Exod 14:31 and Num 12:7–8. In 12:6a, the phrase occurs in all witnesses, but is lacking in the LXX in its second occurrence in the verse (v 6b). It is therefore likely that a scribe rather than an editor added the phrase in v 6b in the wake of v 6a. At the same time, it is intriguing that the phrase was added in MT in the very first verse of the book, indicating that the scribe knew of its occurrence in the text that follows (vv 2, 7, 13). It is again lacking in v 15 LXX.

1:7 … to observe faithfully according to (all the teaching which) {that} Moses my servant enjoined upon you.[16] The full Dtr phrase mentioning שמר, עשה, and תורה occurs in different variations in Josh 23:6 and Deut 17:19; 28:58; 29:28; 31:12; 32:46.[17] The translator had the short phrase in front of him, without תורה, as is clear from the translation of the masculine suffix אל תסור ממנו ("do not deviate from it"). In fact, the masculine suffix in MT is a clear indication that התורה was added at a later stage without adapting the context.[18]

1:11 the land that the Lord your God[19] is giving you (as a possession [לרשתה]). The additional word in MT is based on the almost identical phrase in Deut 15:4 and 25:19 "in the land that the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance

---

favor of retroverting elements of the Hebrew parent text of the LXX are provided by L. Mazor, *The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua – Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994, 27–73 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

[12] Some data were collected for the first time in Tov, "The Growth," 394 (see n. 1 above). These data were quoted by T. Römer and A. de Pury, "Deuteronomistic Historiography," in *Israel Constructs Its History*, 24–141 (91). While we believe that the LXX found in these cases a short Hebrew text, M. N. van der Meer, *Formulation and Reformulation–The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004) 178–93, 246 ascribed the shortening to the translator.

[13] This phrase is found often in the text shared by MT and the LXX: 1:2, 7, 13; 8:31 (LXX: 9:2b), 33 (LXX 9:2d); 9:24; 11:12, 15; 13:8; 14:7; 18:7; 22:2, 5; 24:29 (= Judg 2:8).

[14] S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Meridian, 1956) 116.

[15] Weinfeld, 332 (2).

[16] MT לעשות ככל התורה אשר צוך משה עבדי אל תסור ממנו, LXX (reconstructed) לעשות ככל אשר צוך משה אל תסור ממנה.

[17] Weinfeld, 336 (17b).

[18] For the short phrase עשה + ככל + verb of command, see Deut 17:10; 24:8 and other sources (Gen 6:22; 7:5; Exod 29:35; Num 2:34; 2 Kgs 16:16).

[19] LXX "the God of your fathers."

(נחלה) to possess (לרשתה)" as well as in Deut 4:21; 19:10; 20:16; 24:4; 26:1; 1 Kgs 8:36 (all with נחלה only).[20] The same verb is lacking in the LXX of v 15 (see next entry).

1:15 MT Then you shall return *to the land of your possession*, and you may possess it, that Moses … gave you. LXX: Then you shall return *each to his territory* that Moses … gave you.[21] Although the formulations of the long MT and the short LXX run parallel, that of MT is suspicious since the secondary nature of the added Dtr[22] phrase ("and you may possess it") is evident from the syntax of the continuation of the sentence (אשר נתן לכם משה) that refers to the phrase preceding the added phrase.[23] The formulations of both MT[24] and the LXX[25] suit the context, but MT is probably secondary because of the syntactical argument.

8:31 (LXX 9:2b) as is written in the (Book of the) Teaching of Moses. Both the short text of the LXX (cf. Josh 8:32; 1 Kings 2:3) and the long one of MT (cf. Josh 23:6; 2 Kgs 14:6) reflect Dtr expressions (Weinfeld, 339 [23, 24]). See also the next item:

8:34 (LXX 9:2c) as is written in the Book of the Teaching. LXX: according to all the things written in the Teaching of Moses. Both phrases occur elsewhere in Dtr.[26]

24:17 For it was the Lord our God who brought us and our fathers up from the land of Egypt, (the house of bondage, and who wrought those wondrous signs before our very eyes). For the house of bondage (בית עבדים), see Weinfeld, 326–7 (2), and for אתות ומופתים, see ibid., 330 (18).

1b. A quotation from Deuteronomy in MT-Joshua

23:16b (… then the Lord's anger will burn against you, and you shall quickly perish from the good land that he has given you = Deut 11:17). The previous verse, v 15, describes the calamities that will befall Israel, but as the verse stands

---

[20] Weinfeld, 341 (1).

[21] MT ושבתם איש לנחלתו אשר נתן לכם, LXX ושבתם לארץ ירשתכם וירשתם אותה אשר נתן לכם משה משה.

[22] See Deut 4:1, 22; 8:1; 11:8, 31 (Weinfeld, 342 [5]).

[23] The JPS translation removes the difficulties by changing the sequence of the elements in the translation: "Then you may return to the land on the east side of the Jordan, which Moses the servant of the Lord assigned to you as your possession, and you may possess it." NRSV adds "the land" removing the difficulty in a different way: "Then you shall return to your own land and take possession of it, *the land* <my italics, E. T.> that Moses the servant of the Lord gave you beyond the Jordan to the east."

[24] For ארץ ירשתכם, cf. Deut 2:12 "the land of their possession, which the Lord had given to them."

[25] The combination of a verb of motion + "each to his territory" (איש לנחלתו) occurs in such contexts as Josh 24:28 = Judg 2:6; Judg 21:24; Jer 12:15.

[26] The LXX or its parent text may have been rephrased in accord with v 31 quoted above. The MT phrase, ספר התורה, as well as (הזה) ספר התורה הואת occurs often in Deuteronomy as well as in Josh 1:8; 2 Kings 22:8, 11 (Weinfeld, 339 [23]).

it does not explain the reason for these calamities.[27] The next verse does provide the explanation (16a: "if you break the covenant"), but is not connected to the previous one, since v 16a forms the protasis of v 16b (lacking in the LXX). The short text of the LXX possibly reflects the earlier formulation that someone misunderstood. In this earlier text (= LXX), v 16a is the protasis to the conditional clause in v 15,[28] and the full thought is expressed in vv 15–16a.[29] However, someone may have supplemented v 16b, construing the verse as if v 16a began a new thought. A major argument in favor of this view is the fact that v 16b equals Deut 11:17, making it likely that this verse was copied here from Deuteronomy.

1c. A passage revised according to Deuteronomy in MT-Joshua

The short text of the LXX of Joshua 20, prescribing the establishment of the cities of refuge, does not contain some key elements of MT in that chapter (the greater part of vv 4–6 and the phrase בבלי דעת "unintentionally" in v 3).[30] The earlier formulation reflected in the LXX follows the legislation of the Priestly Code for the cities of refuge (Num 35:9–15). On the other hand, the plus in MT mainly follows the ideas and terminology of Deut 4:42 and 19:4, 11–12 for the same cities, much different from those of P. Most likely, the LXX reflects an earlier formulation of the chapter, while MT (followed by all other witnesses) reflects a later version that brought the formulation of Joshua based on P into harmony with the law code of Deuteronomy.[31] If this analysis is correct, it was an editor rather than a scribe who altered the earlier message of the book towards Deuteronomy. The insertions from Deuteronomy in MT created contextual tensions between the two layers of the text.[32]

---

[27] However, to some extent the content of Deut 28:63 is phrased similarly.

[28] Thus S. Holmes, *Joshua, The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge: University Press, 1914) 78.

[29] The protasis usually stands before the apodosis, but very occasionally it stands at the end (for example, Gen 18:28). I am grateful to my colleague S. Kogut for providing me with this reference and for discussing the syntactic difficulties of this verse with me.

[30] The duplication in MT (בשגגה בבלי דעת) shows the lateness of the present formulation of that text. It is likely that the LXX lacks בבלי דעת, but this assumption is not certain, since ἀκουσίως of the LXX in v 3 reflects בשגגה in Num 35:11 and בבלי דעת in Deut 19:4.

[31] However, in one important detail, the revised text followed Num 35:25.

[32] For a detailed analysis, see A. Rofé, "Joshua 20 – Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated," in Tigay, *Empirical Models*, 131–47; A. G. Auld, "Textual and Literary Studies in the Book of Joshua," *ZAW* 90 (1978) 412–7; idem, "The "Levitical Cities" – Texts and History," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 194–206; Tov, *TCHB*, 329–30.

2. Pluses in the LXX based on Deuteronomy

9:27 in the place that he (LXX: the Lord) would choose.[33] The LXX expands the short text of MT[34] to the full Dtr phrase (e.g. Deut 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21).

24:4 +and they became there a great nation, mighty and populous+. The harmonizing addition of the LXX (see the context) is based on a Hebrew version of Deut 26:5 (the LXX versions of Joshua and Deuteronomy differ in several details).

Summarizing the evidence for Joshua, we believe that the variants in groups 1a–b and 2 were created by (a) scribe(s) with no connection to the Dtr reworking of the book. Most instances refer to Dtr phrases in MT that are lacking in the LXX. In 8:31 and 34, MT and the LXX contain alternative Dtr phrases, and in two instances (group 2) the LXX is longer than MT. Most of the variations occur in sections that abound with Dtr phraseology, mainly in chapter 1. In those chapters in Joshua in which Dtr phraseology is either lacking or occurs sporadically, the textual sources do not differ regarding Dtr terminology. Thus, while in chapters 2, 6, 7, and 8 many details are not reflected in the LXX, these details are unrelated to Dtr phraseology. Some of the pluses in MT occur more than once. With refined literary understanding, Holmes pointed out that the lack of similar expressions in MT as in 1:11 and 15 "raises the suspicion that they are insertions by a later hand."[35] All the Dtr phrases that are lacking in the LXX are part and parcel of the standard Dtr vocabulary and could easily have been added in MT by a scribe, as suggested in the above analysis of 1:1.

On the other hand, the variants described in group 1c can only have been inserted at the compositional level. Had there been more evidence of this type, we would have named this a second layer of Dtr reflected in MT. Editorial activity, unrelated to Dtr,[36] is also visible in chapters 21 and 24 in MT (not in the LXX)[37] but it is unclear whether the same hand was active in all three chapters (20, 21, 24).

---

[33] LXX ἐκλέξηται κύριος probably reflects יבחר יהוה.

[34] See Weinfeld, 324 (1) for the short phrase.

[35] Holmes, *Hebrew and Greek Texts*, 1, 18.

[36] See further the analysis below of the plus in MT LXX in 1 Kings 16:34 parallel to the addition in the LXX of Josh 6:26. The addition in Joshua lacks the Dtr fulfillment formula, but its stress on the fulfillment of prophecies may be described as Deuteronomistic. However, by the same token the addition may have been made within the framework of the rewriting of the Hebrew composition that lay at the base of the LXX without connection to Dtr.

[37] See A. Rofé, "The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint," *Hen* 4 (1982) 17–35 = *Shnaton* 2 (1977) 217–27 (Heb.); Tov, *TCHB*, 330–32.

1–2 Kings

The LXX of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms) differs much from MT, and its evidence may be trusted since its translation technique is fairly literal. Having said that, we are faced with a major problem since the discrepancies are among the most extensive in the LXX.[38] These differences bear on Dtr phraseology in three sections, but their relevance to Dtr remains a matter of dispute. In three instances (1, 3, 4), the LXX has a shorter text, while in item 2 the LXX has a longer text.

1. 1 Kgs 6:11–14: (Then the word of the Lord came to Solomon, "With regard to this House you are building – if you follow My laws and observe My rules and faithfully keep My commandments, I will fulfill for you the promise that I gave to your father David: I will abide among the children of Israel, and I will never forsake my people Israel. So Solomon built the house, and finished it).

In 1 Kings, the LXX usually has a longer text than MT in matters unrelated to Dtr, and therefore the absence of a relatively large section in the LXX is rather intriguing. The prophecy of a conditional promise in 6:11–14, in the middle of the description of the building of the temple in 6:1–38; 7:13–51, is out of place in this technical context.[39] Gray therefore names these verses a "Deuteronomic sidenote."[40] This section reflects the ideas of Nathan's oracle in 2 Samuel 7, containing some Dtr phrases. In the middle of the technical description of the building of the temple an editor probably considered it important to remind the readers that the presence of the building was not a guarantee of the continued existence of the royal dynasty and the temple. However, the Dtr nature of this section is unclear, although it contains some manifest Dtr phrases:[41]

v 12 שמר מצוה (Weinfeld, 336 [16])
v 12 הקים דבר יהוה (Weinfeld, 350 [1])

At the same time this section also contains some priestly terms:

v 12b This verse (אם תלך בחקתי ואת משפטי תעשה ושמרת את כל מצותי ללכת בהם) is very close to Lev 18:4a (את משפטי תעשו ואת חקתי תשמרו ללכת בהם).
v 13 שכן בתוך בני ישראל (Exod 25:8; 29:45, 46; Ezek 43:7, 9).

---

[38] See chapter 20*.

[39] On the other hand, according to D. W. Gooding, "Temple Specifications: A Dispute in Logical Arrangement between the MT and the LXX," *VT* 17 (1967) 143–72 (154–9), this paragraph separates vv 2–10, describing the outer structure of the temple, from vv 15–36 pertaining to the interior divisions, decorations, and installations of the temple. However, the location of the oracle, together with the summary phrase in v 14 in the midst of a technical description, remains out of place.

[40] J. Gray, *I & II Kings, A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963) 157.

[41] For a good analysis of the vocabulary, see C. F. Burney, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (repr. New York: Ktav, 1970 [1903]) 68–9.

One phrase is used both in Dtr and the Priestly Code:

v 12 הלך בחקתי (Lev 18:3; 20:23; 26:3; 1 Kgs 3:3; 6:12; 2 Kgs 17:8, 19; Jer 44 (LXX: 51):10, 23, Ezek 5:6, 7; 11:20; 20:13, 16, 19; 20:21).

While some scholars consider this prophecy to be pre-Dtr, Dtr, or a second layer of Dtr, others consider it a combination of H (Lev 26:3, 14, 15) and P (Exod 25:8).[42] The passage was possibly added to MT by someone who based himself on the vocabulary of the Bible as a whole.[43] In any event, this section is probably irrelevant to the assumption of late Dtr insertions.

2. 1 Kgs 9:9: It is because they forsook the Lord their God who freed them from the land of Egypt LXX +from the house of slavery+ (Weinfeld, 326 [2]). This phrase was added in accord with similar contexts, especially Deut 7:8.[44]

3. An alternative story (AS) of Jeroboam, extant only in the LXX (3 Kgdms 12:24a–z), presents a rival story about Jerobeam juxtaposed with the original story that is found in all textual sources including the LXX (1 Kings 11, 12, 14). The technique of juxtaposing two versions of the same story was used from ancient times onwards in the composition of Hebrew Scripture. For example, different accounts of the creation and the flood were juxtaposed and partially intertwined in Genesis. In all these cases, the two versions are now included in all textual witnesses. However, with one exception (1 Samuel 16–18),[45] there is no parallel for the juxtaposition of two alternative versions in one textual witness but not in the others. The AS has been retroverted into Hebrew by Debus and Talshir,[46] and its text needs to be taken into full consideration in biblical criticism. Scholars' evaluations of the AS vary considerably.

The main story, in chapters 11, 12, and 14, contains several Dtr elements that are lacking in the parallel places in the AS. If the LXX evidence is to be trusted, the AS may well contain a valuable pre-Dtr document. For example, the Dtr phrase in 1 Kgs 14:21 MT LXX (the city the Lord had chosen out of all the tribes of Israel to establish His name there) is missing in the parallel verse, 3 Kgdms 12:24a. Likewise, 14:23–24 MT LXX (They too built for themselves shrines, pillars, and sacred posts on every high hill and under every leafy tree [24] … Judah

[42] See the survey of opinions and analysis by van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 142–50 (143, n. 5).

[43] Thus V. A. Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House. Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings* (JSOTSup 115; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 262, n. 3.

[44] Likewise, cf. the long formulation in Judg 6:8 with the shorter one in 1 Sam 10:18.

[45] In these chapters, the originally short story of the encounter of David and Goliath as narrated in the LXX was joined by an alternative story in MT. See my analysis in "The Composition of 1 Samuel 17–18 in the Light of the Evidence of the Septuagint Version," in Tigay, *Empirical Models,* 97–130; revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 333–60.

[46] See chapter 20*, notes 25 and 26.

imitated all the abhorrent practices of the nations that the Lord had dispossessed before the Israelites) is missing in 3 Kgdms 12:24a.[47] The Dtr fulfillment formula in 14:18 MT (in accordance with the word that the Lord had spoken through His servant the prophet Ahijah) is lacking in 3 Kgdms 12:24n. The Dtr verses MT 14:8–9 have no counterpart in the AS.[48] The Dtr phraseology in 1 Kgs 14:10 MT (Therefore I will bring disaster upon the House of Jeroboam and will cut off from Jeroboam every male, bond and free, in Israel)[49] is reflected in the AS in a shorter form, in 12:24m (I will cut off from Jeroboam every male). At the same time, the AS is not devoid of Dtr phrases; for example, 3 Kgdms 12:24x–z (= 1 Kgs 12:21–24) is Dtr (see also n. 41). As a result, both the long version of MT (sometimes followed by LXX *ad loc.*) and the short version of AS are Deuteronomistic, but MT is much more so.

Debus[50], Trebolle[51], and Schenker attach great importance to the AS as a pre-Dtr version. Schenker recognizes some Dtr elements in the story, but he nevertheless considers the story early and pre-Deuteronomistic.[52]

On the other hand, McKenzie[53] believes that the Greek text of 3 Kgdms goes back to a Hebrew text that was already Deuteronomistic. He argues that the AS has no logical structure and therefore cannot have been original. Many details in the AS cannot stand by themselves, and they clearly presuppose MT.[54] Talshir[55] likewise stresses that the lack of Dtr elements in the AS derives from the internal

---

[47] However, the same verse in the AS, 12:24a, does contain a different Dtr phrase (he did what was displeasing to the Lord = MT 14:22).

[48] Note the following Dtr phrases in these verses:
v 8 כעבדי דוד (cf. Weinfeld, 354 [1])
v 8 שמר מצוה (Weinfeld, 336 [16])
v 8 הלך אחרי יהוה (Weinfeld, 332 [1])
v 8 בכל לבבו (Weinfeld, 334 [9a])
v 8 עשה הישר בעיני יהוה (Weinfeld, 335 [15])
v 9 הלך ועשה אלהים אחרים (Weinfeld, 321 [5])
v 9 להכעיסני (Weinfeld, 340 [6])

[49] Cf. Weinfeld 352 (12) והכרתי לירבעם משתין בקיר.

[50] Debus, *Die Sünde Jerobeams*, 84–7.

[51] J. C. Trebolle Barrera, "Testamento y muerte de David," *RB* 87 (1980) 87–103 (102); idem, *Salomon y Jeroboan, Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Reyes, 2–12; 14* (Institución San Jerónimo 10; Bibliotheca Salamanticensis 3; Valencia, 1980) 173–4; idem, "Redaction, Recension, and Midrash in the Books of Kings," *BIOSCS* 15 (1982) 12–35 (23).

[52] A. Schenker, "Jeroboam and the Division of the Kingdom in the Ancient Septuagint: LXX 3 Kingdoms 12.24 a–z, MT 1 Kings 11–12; 14 and the Deuteronomistic History," in *Israel Constructs Its History,* 214–57 (237, 250).

[53] S. L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings*, *The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden/New York/Copenhagen/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1991) 21–40.

[54] McKenzie, *The Trouble*, 29–31.

[55] Z. Talshir, "Is the Alternate Tradition of the Division of the Kingdom (3 Kgdms 12:24a–z) Non-Deuteronomistic?" in G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* (SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 599–621; eadem, *The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom: 3 Kingdoms 12:24a–z* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6; Jerusalem: Simor, 1993).

dynamics of that version. The AS does not present Jeroboam as a king, and therefore the text does not reflect a dynastic perspective.[56] As a result, all references to a royal dynasty are omitted, including most Dtr segments.

We accept the views of McKenzie and Talshir, not only because of the arguments given by them, but also because we attach much importance to the overall evaluation of 3 Kingdoms as a faithful rendering of a Hebrew rewritten book of 1 Kings,[57] differing more from MT than most other books in Hebrew Scripture. Within the framework of that unit, the much rewritten Alternative Story causes no surprise; the AS adds several elements to the MT version and also shortens that story in details it considered inappropriate in the new context, including several Dtr phrases.

4. 1 Kgs 16:34: (During his reign, Hiel the Bethelite fortified Jericho. He laid its foundations at the cost of Abiram his first-born, and set its gates in place at the cost of Segub his youngest, in accordance with the words that the Lord had spoken through Joshua son of Nun.) This Dtr addition is found in all textual traditions with the exception of LXX^{Luc}. The secondary character of this verse is easily recognizable since it is not connected to any detail in the context. V 34 is preceded by an account of the sins of Ahab (up to v 33) and followed by an account of the drought (17:1), which came as a punishment for Ahab's sins. Furthermore, the verse is introduced by the general phrase "during his reign," probably pointing to an insertion in the text. It may have been added at a late stage in the Hebrew (and Greek) tradition, since LXX^{Luc}, when differing from the main Greek tradition, often reflects original elements in the historical books.[58]

When emphasizing that the curse of Joshua was fulfilled, the editor who added the verse in 1 Kings followed the pattern of many other Dtr prophecies,[59] all using the same fixed phrases as in 1 Kgs 16:34.[60]

The same addition, without the Dtr fulfillment formula, is found in the LXX after Josh 6:26, following Joshua's curse: (And so did Hozan of Baithel; he laid the foundation in Abiron his first-born, and set up the gates of it in his young-

[56] For example, Talshir, "Alternate Tradition," 608 remarks regarding the Dtr phrases in 1 Kgs 14:10–11 missing in 3 Kgdms 12:24m: "Here too the national and dynastic features are missing, and again one has to bear in mind that they are unwarranted in the scene of the sick child where it stands in the alternate tradition: Jeroboam is not yet king, neither was he promised kingship. Naturally his dynasty cannot be threatened." Concerning the lack of the Dtr fulfillment formula of 1 Kgs 14:18 in 3 Kgdms 12:24n Talshir, p. 614 says: "In my opinion they were simply left out by the author to make room for his own carefully construed endings."

[57] See chapter 20*.

[58] See my study "Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem," *RB* 79 (1972) 101–13. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 477–88.

[59] For example, 1 Kgs 8:20 referring to 2 Sam 7:13. For additional examples and an analysis, see G. von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy* (tr. D. Stalker; London: SCM Press, 1953) 74–91 ("The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings").

[60] See the list of Dtr terms for this type of prophecy listed by Weinfeld, 350–52.

est surviving son).[61] The plus in the LXX of Joshua, clearly based on a Hebrew source,[62] is *not* a harmonizing Greek addition based on the LXX of 1 Kgs 16:34, since the texts differ in important details.[63] In the plus in the LXX of Joshua, these details are in the nature of a statement of facts; in the MT and LXX of 1 Kings, they are phrased as the fulfillment of a prophecy made "in accordance with the words that the Lord had spoken through Joshua son of Nun." According to some scholars, MT LXX of 1 Kings is based on the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX in Joshua.[64] While the exact relation between the texts remains unclear, it stands to reason that the brief Dtr note was added in 1 Kings MT during one of the stages of the book's development. The addition in the LXX of Joshua was probably made independently.

5. 2 Kgs 17:32: A long Dtr. addition in the LXX ("And they feared the Lord … in which they dwelt") must have belonged to the original text, omitted in MT by way of *homoioteleuton*.

Summarizing the evidence for 1–2 Kings, we note that the LXX of 3 Kingdoms lacks several elements and sections that have been ascribed to Dtr. However, in chapter 6 the Dtr character of MT is unlikely, and in chapter 12 the pre-Dtr nature of the large plus in the LXX has not been proven. On the other hand, LXX^{Luc} reflects a pre-Dtr text in 1 Kgs 16:34.

Jeremiah

Several scholars recognized that many of the differences between MT and LXX in Jeremiah are not scribal (textual), but were created during one of the stages of the book's composition.[65] Most of the differences pertain to minuses of the LXX

[61] For an analysis and reconstruction of the Hebrew parent text of the LXX in this detail, see L. Mazor, "The Origin and Evolution of the Curse upon the Rebuilder of Jericho – A Contribution of Textual Criticism to Biblical Historiography," *Textus* 14 (1988) 1–26.

[62] See the reconstruction by Mazor, "Origin," 13.

[63] For example, in 1 Kgs 16:34 MT and LXX, Hiel the Bethelite rebuilt the city while in the LXX of Joshua it was rebuilt by Ozan. In that translation, the name of his second son, Segub, is rendered etymologically as "his youngest *surviving* son." Holmes, *Hebrew and Greek Texts*, 37 suggests that the translation reflects the root שׁגב.

[64] Thus Holmes, *Hebrew and Greek Texts*, 37; A. Rofé, *The Prophetical Stories* (2d ed.; Heb.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986) 156; Mazor, "Origin," 23.

[65] For the latest summaries, see *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception* (ed. A. H. W. Curtis and T. Römer; BETL 128; Leuven University Press, 1997); *Troubling Jeremiah* (ed. A. R. P. Diamond et al.; JSOTSup 260; Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); T. Römer, "Is There a Deuteronomistic Redaction in the Book of Jeremiah?," in *Israel Constructs Its History*, 399–421. See, further, the studies mentioned in n. 71.

as opposed to longer readings of MT.[66] Among these minuses are 44 items (involving more words) reflecting Dtr phrases that may be subdivided into (1) individual phrases and (2) a quote from Deuteronomy. In addition, the LXX reflects a Dtr plus (3). In fact, the largest number of discrepancies between the textual sources in Dtr phraseology in any of the biblical books is found in Jeremiah. The analysis of this vocabulary is complex since beyond the Dtr vocabulary based on Deuteronomy,[67] the Dtr layer reflects phrases that are characteristic of the reviser himself (C). When listing the Dtr phrases lacking in the LXX, we base ourselves on the lists of Dtr phrases in Jeremiah compiled by Weinfeld and Stulman.[68] All these phrases occur in Dtr contexts in the C layer, sometimes in small or large segments in Dtr phraseology (for example, 11:7–8; 29:16–20) and less frequently in single verses in poetry (e. g., 13:10; 23:22) or in biographic contexts (40:12; 43:5). In all these cases, the Dtr phrases are surrounded by other redactional words not phrased in the specific Dtr vocabulary.

1. Individual phrases in MT not represented in the LXX

7:2 (that enter these gates): Weinfeld, 353 (11); Stulman, 83
7:13 and though I spoke to you (persistently השכם ודבר), you would not listen: Weinfeld, 352 (1); Stulman, 70
11:7 (obey my voice): Weinfeld, 337 (18a); Stulman, 1
11:7 for I have (repeatedly and persistently השכם והעד) warned your fathers: Weinfeld, 352 (1); Stulman, 70
11:8 (they would not give ear): Weinfeld, 352 (5); Stulman, 72
11:8 (they all followed the willfulness of their evil hearts: Weinfeld, 340 (8); Stulman, 54
11:8 (the words of this covenant): Stulman, 42
13:10 this wicked people who refuse to heed my bidding (who follow the willfulness of their own hearts): Weinfeld, 340 (8); Stulman, 54

[66] Min records 3097 words of MT not represented in the LXX, amounting to some 16 percent of the Hebrew book: Y. J. Min, *The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins*, unpubl. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1977.

[67] The book of Jeremiah is composed of poetry and prose, since the prophet probably spoke and wrote in both of these forms. However, some of the prose sections referring to Jeremiah in the third person probably did not derive from the prophet, and Dtr elements have been recognized in some of them. Against this background, a theory was devised by S. Mowinckel, *Zur Komposition des Buches Jeremia* (Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1914) describing the various layers of the book: A (Jeremiah's authentic sayings), B (Jeremiah's biographer), and C (a Dtr layer). In the aftermath of Mowinckel's seminal study, many theories have been launched describing the special nature of the C layer, some of them in defiance of Mowinckel's views, but the assumption of a C layer probably remains the most stable one in the scholarly literature. Within that theory, there is room for several variations.

[68] See n. 7.

16:4 (and their corpses shall be food) for the birds of the sky and the beasts of the earth: Weinfeld, 349 (22); Stulman, 53
18:11 and mend (your ways and) your actions: Weinfeld, 352 (2b); Stulman 82
19:9 because of the desperate straits to which they will be reduced by their enemies (who seek their life): Stulman, 77
21:9 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman, 69
21:12 else my wrath will break forth like fire and burn, with none to quench it (because of your wicked acts): Weinfeld, 352 (3); Stulman, 63
23:22 and make them turn back (from their evil ways) and wicked acts; Weinfeld, 352 (2–2b); Stulman, 63
25:7 (to provoke me with the work of your hands): Weinfeld, 340 (6); Stulman, 8
25:18 (as at this day): Weinfeld, 350 (4); Stulman, 14.
27:5 (man and beast): Stulman, 73
27:8 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman, 69
27:13 (sword, famine, and pestilence): Stulman, 69
29:14 (I will restore your fortunes): Stulman, 51
29:14, 18 (to which I have banished you): Weinfeld, 348 (15); Stulman, 52
29:17, 18 (sword, famine, and pestilence): Stulman, 69
29:18 (and an object of horror and hissing and scorn): Weinfeld, 348 (21); Stulman, 56
29:19 (my servants the prophets): Weinfeld, 351 (9); Stulman, 5
29:19 when I (persistently השכים ושלח) sent to them my servants: Weinfeld, 352 (1); Stulman, 70
29:21 (who prophesy lies): Stulman, 75
32:24 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman, 69
32:30 (to provoke me with the work of your hands): Weinfeld, 6; Stulman, 8
33:14 (behold, days are coming): Stulman, 43
33:14 (I established my word): Weinfeld, 350 (1); Stulman, 15
33:17 (There shall never be an end to men of David's line who sit upon the throne of the House of Israel): Weinfeld, 355 (8); Stulman, 32
33:26 [within a large minus] (I will restore their fortunes): Stulman, 51
34:20, 21 (to those who seek to kill them): Stulman, 77
35:15 I (persistently השכים ושלח) sent you all my servants: Weinfeld, 352 (1); Stulman, 70
35:18 (I called to them, but they would not respond): Stulman, 89
38:16 (to those who seek your life): Stulman, 77
40:12 All these Judeans returned from all the places (to which they had scattered): Weinfeld 348 (15); Stulman, 52
43:5 the entire remnant of Judah who had returned (from all the countries to which they had been scattered: Weinfeld 348 (15); Stulman, 52
44:13 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman, 69
44:23 (as at this day): Weinfeld, 350 (4); Stulman, 14

48:47 (But I will restore the fortunes of Moab): Stulman, 51
49:6 (I will restore the fortunes of the Ammonites): Stulman, 51
52:3 (within a large minus) (He cast them out of His presence): Weinfeld, 347 (11a); Stulman, 33

2. A quote from Deuteronomy in MT not represented in the LXX

28:16 you shall die this year (for you have urged disloyalty [סרה דברת] to the Lord). The phrase דבר סרה occurs in Jer 29:32 MT (not LXX) and elsewhere only in Deut 13:6.[69]

3. A plus in the LXX

19:3 +that enter these gates+: Weinfeld, 353 (11); Stulman, 83

As a rule, the LXX of Jeremiah is shorter than MT. Elsewhere, the suggestion has been made that the LXX embodies a short edition of Jeremiah (ed. I)[70] that was expanded to the long edition of MT (ed. II) with a layer of exegetical and editorial expansions.[71] This layer includes a sizeable number of Dtr expressions as listed above, but these form but a small percentage of the Dtr layer in Jeremiah (the C layer) that also includes non-stereotyped language. When trying to understand the nature of the Dtr phrases added in ed. II, we note that all of them occur also in ed. I (the material common to the MT and LXX). It therefore stands to reason that these contexts in ed. I influenced the addition of the Dtr phrases in the later

[69] Weinfeld, 99 quotes the Akkadian parallel to this term (*dabab surrate)*, and notes that this "appears to be an expression taken from the political vocabulary of the period." While the phrase in Deuteronomy refers to a prophet who incites to the worship of "other Gods" (Deut 13:3 let us follow other Gods), the mentioned prophets prophesy in the name of the God of Israel.

[70] Several scholars believe that the Dtr layer in Jeremiah is not one of the sources of the book, but that Dtr himself was the editor of the book. Thus J. P. Hyatt, "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy," *JNES* 1 (1942) 156–73 = *A Prophet to the Nations, Essays in Jeremiah Studies* (ed. L. G. Perdue and B. W. Kovacs; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1984) 113–27; idem, "The Deuteronomic Edition of Jeremiah," in *Vanderbilt Studies in the Humanities* (ed. R. C. Beatty et al.; Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1951) 1.71–95 = *A Prophet to the Nations,* 247–67. These views were further developed by Thiel in his 1970 dissertation and subsequent publications, as well as by others: W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25* (WMANT 41; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); idem, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–52* (WMANT 52; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981); E. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles. A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1970); W. McKane, *Jeremiah*, vols. 1–2 (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986, 1996) 1.xlvii–lxxxiii; Person, *Second Zechariah*, 30.

[71] Beyond the studies mentioned in n. 65, see my own studies: "Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," in *Le livre de Jérémie, le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission* (ed. P.-M. Bogaert; BETL 54; Leuven: Leuven University Press/ Peeters, 1981; rev. ed. 1997 [1998]) 145–67, 430; "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," in *Empirical Models,* 211–37. Revised version: *Greek and Hebrew Bible,* 363–84 (368, 379–80).

ed. II. When trying to understand the nature of these phrases within the framework of the composition of Jeremiah, two explanations suggest themselves:[72]

a. Editor II (MT) was so well versed in the terminology of Dtr found in ed. I that he occasionally expanded the earlier text with phrases occurring elsewhere in the book[73] together with the other, non-Dtr elements.

b. The added Dtr material in MT, together with the other editorial additions in that layer, was added to ed. I by a late Dtr editor. This theory implies that the Dtr school reworked Jeremiah twice.[74]

When assessing these two assumptions, we note that with one exception,[75] the phrases added in ed. II include no elements that were independently drawn from either Deuteronomy or the Dtr literature beyond the vocabulary of Jeremiah.[76] This fact precludes the assumption of independent Dtr activity (option 2), while the added layer does reflect editorial activity in other details.

Ed. II was actively involved in the editing and rewriting of ed. I. His ideological and theological trends as well as his post-exilic reflections are clearly recognizable.[77] Therefore an analysis that is limited to the Dtr elements in ed. II cannot do justice to the complexity of the issues. The additional layer of ed. II includes a sizeable number of Dtr expressions as listed above, but it is much smaller than the Dtr layer in Jeremiah as a whole (the assumption of the C layer covers both editions I and II). It also forms but a small percentage of the additional layer of ed. II.[78] As a result, taking our clue from editor II's terminology and ideas, we do not link him to the Dtr school of reworking Scripture.[79]

---

[72] The one addition of a Dtr element in LXX (group 3 above [Jer 19:3]) may be disregarded for this purpose.

[73] Among other things, this editor not only added Dtr phrases, but also supplemented short Dtr phrases with longer ones: 16:4 (and their corpses shall be food) for the birds of the sky and the beasts of the earth: Weinfeld, 349 (22), Stulman, 53; 18:11 and mend (your ways and) your actions: Weinfeld, 352 (2b); Stulman, 82; 21:9, 27:8, 32:24, 44:13 sword, famine, (and pestilence): Stulman, 69; 23:22 and make them turn back (from their evil ways) and wicked acts: Weinfeld, 352 (2–2b), Stulman, 63.

[74] Thus Person, *Second Zechariah*, 75.

[75] Jer 28:16 quoted in group 2 above.

[76] Thus also Stulman, 139 with statistical data.

[77] See my study "The Characterization of the Additional Layer of the Masoretic Text of Jeremiah," *ErIsr* 26 (ed. B. A. Levine et al.; Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1999) 55–63; Y. Goldman, *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie* (OBO 118; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992); H.-J. Stipp, *Das Masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches, Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO 136; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); Person, *Second Zechariah*, 69–77 ("Material Unique to MT-Jeremiah").

[78] See the statistical data in Stulman, 119–44.

[79] Ed. II "updates" and "corrects" the events described in some prophecies, but he does not use the phrases of the Dtr fulfillment of prophecies (see n. 59 above). See 25:14; 27:7, 19–22; 32:5, and the analysis in Tov, "Literary History," 383–4.

2 Kings 18–20//Isaiah 36–39 and 2 Kings 24:18–25:30//Jeremiah 52

At first sight, the comparison of the parallel versions in 2 Kings//Isaiah and 2 Kings//Jeremiah is not directly related to the investigation of the Dtr elements in the Bible. However, these chapters in Kings and Jeremiah do contain several Dtr phrases, and some of them are not shared by the parallel chapters or by some of the textual witnesses.

In a very detailed study, Person suggested that in both cases the lack of Dtr elements in some sources (probably better: the addition of Dtr elements in other sources) indicates that these chapters are composed of two Dtr layers.[80] According to Person, these two layers show that the Dtr revision was created in stages, or was composed by two or three individuals, as had been suggested earlier without any connection to textual evidence.[81] However, in my view, the system used by Person is flawed methodologically for both 2 Kings//Isaiah[82] and 2 Kings//Jer-

[80] R. F. Person, *The Kings-Isaiah and Kings-Jeremiah Recensions* (BZAW 252; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1997). The second part of this book replaces the author's earlier study "II Kings 24,18–25,30 and Jeremiah 52: A Text-Critical Case Study in the Redaction History of the Deuteronomistic History?" *ZAW* 105 (1993) 174–205. Person's conclusion is summarized on p. 77 of the book: "The text critical evidence strongly suggests that the book of Kings and, by implication, DtrH underwent *at least* two redactions. The earlier redaction is represented by the *Urtext* <that is, Person's reconstructed *Urtext* of Kings, E. T.>; the later by KH <that is, the MT of Kings>."

[81] W. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 139–48; E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige* (ATD 11.1–2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977, 1984) 2.474.

[82] Person includes four Dtr phrases in his reconstructed *Urtext* of 2 Kings//Isaiah (2 Kgs 19:15 "you … alone are God" [Weinfeld, 331 (6)], 19:15 "you made the heavens and the earth" [Weinfeld, 331 (7)], 19:18 "gods … made by human hands" [Weinfeld, 324 (7)], and 19:34 "for the sake of David, my servant" [Weinfeld, 354 (1)]). In three of these cases, the reconstructed *Urtext* follows Kings when its text is identical to Isaiah (2 Kgs 19:15 = Isa 37:16 [actually also v 15 = Isa 37:20]; 19:18 = Isa 37:19; 19:34 = Isa 37:35), and once when differing from Isaiah (the second instance in 2 Kgs 19:15 = Isa 37:16). He notes (p. 77) that in two additional instances the 2 Kings text (for him: recension) has a Dtr phrase not shared with Isaiah (2 Kgs 20:6 "for the sake of David, my servant" not found in Isa 38:5 and the direct speech in 2 Kgs 18:25b). The Dtr formulae are evident, but Person's separation of the reconstructed *Urtext* from the 2 Kings version is less evident. It is unclear why the 2 Kings recension displays the hand of a second Deuteronomist if the one Dtr reading that 2 Kings adds to the reconstructed *Urtext* (2 Kgs 20:6) also occurs in another verse in the 2 Kings recension (19:34 quoted above). The phrase is included in Person's reconstructed *Urtext* (= the 2 Kings recension in 19:34), and therefore cannot be taken as proof of the existence of a second Dtr recension. The phrase in 2 Kgs 20:6 could have been added by a harmonizing scribe. The fact that Person first removes the 2 Kings reading from the reconstructed *Urtext* because Isaiah does not have the reading, and then claims that the 2 Kings reading is a later addition is problematic. The second case is even less clear. Person removes the direct speech of 2 Kgs 18:25 from his reconstructed *Urtext*, and then claims that it was added in the 2 Kings version as a feature of Dtr. However, the Dtr background of this type of change is not explained (p. 78).

emiah.[83] For both textual units, Person reconstructs an "Urtext" which he then compares with the known textual witnesses.[84] As indicated in notes 82–83, there is no evidence for the assumption of two different Dtr recensions in Kings or Jeremiah.[85]

Conclusions

The purpose of this investigation is to find textual material that could show that the Dtr layers in Joshua–2 Kings and Jeremiah were composite. The raison d'être for this analysis is the relatively large number of differences between MT and the LXX in Dtr phraseology (especially details appearing in MT but lacking in the LXX) and the opinions expressed about them.

The results were reviewed book by book, since the textual evidence differs in each case. The overall conclusion is that one needs to be very careful in assuming two different entities in the Dtr layers on the basis of the LXX evidence. In Joshua, most of the relevant variants seem to be scribal pluses. In 1 Kings, as well as in the parallel sections 2 Kings 18–20//Isaiah 36–39 and 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30//Jeremiah 52, most of the evidence is probably irrelevant. In Jeremiah, the evidence is not irrelevant but it does not point to two different layers in Dtr.[86] Rather, several Dtr phrases were probably added routinely in ed. II on the basis of the vocabulary of ed. I, and not of Deuteronomy.

---

[83] The reconstructed *Urtext*, very closely resembling Jeremiah-LXX (see p. 111), is described as Deuteronomistic (pp. 100–102), although no Dtr phrases are listed. Because Person considers the *Urtext* Deuteronomistic, he reconstructed two Dtr stages, although in reality there is only one, that of 2 Kings-MT = 2 Kings-LXX; see 2 Kgs 24:19–20 = Jer 52:2–3 MT ([19]He did what was displeasing to the Lord [Weinfeld, 339 (1)] [20] … so that He cast them out of His presence [Weinfeld, 347 (11a)]). The verse is lacking in the LXX of Jeremiah.

[84] This is not the first textual analysis of these parallel texts, but it is the first to draw the conclusion that the differences between them reflect two Dtr editions. Previous analyses of Kings//Isaiah include A. T. Olmstead, "The Oldest Book of Kings," *AJSL* 31 (1915) 169–214; H. M. Orlinsky, "The Kings–Isaiah Recensions of the Hezekiah Story," *JQR* 30 (1939/1940) 33–49; O. Kaiser, "Die Verkündigung des Propheten Jesaja im Jahre 701," *ZAW* 81 (1969) 304–15; A. Catastini, *Isaia ed Ezechia. Studio di storia della tradizione di II Re 18–20//Is. 36–39* (Studi Semitici, Nuova serie 6; Rome: Università degli Studi "La Sapienza," 1989). For a previous analysis of 2 Kings//Jeremiah, see P.-M. Bogaert, "Les trois formes de Jérémie 52 (TM, LXX et VL)," in *Tradition of the Text*: *Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of His 70th Birthday* (ed. G. J. Norton and S. Pisano; OBO 109; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991) 1–17.

[85] Person's work on these parallel sections should be viewed in light of this scholar's earlier study, *Second Zechariah*, in which he elaborates on the view that the second part of Zechariah (Zech 9–14) was created by Dtr.

[86] This conclusion corrects my view suggested in 1972, when I still considered it possible that there were two different Dtr layers in Jeremiah: "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," *RB* 79 (1972) 189–99 (199).

On the other hand, the evidence of the LXX in Joshua 20[87] and of LXX^{Luc} in 1 Kgs 16:34 could point to a second Dtr layer, but it is too limited when taken by itself. Accordingly, we should be careful when speaking about "the LXX and the Deuteronomists" as in the title of this chapter.

[87] Wellhausen and Cooke suggested that the MT redaction was created after the time of the LXX translation: J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; repr. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963) 132; G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Joshua* (CB; Cambridge: University Press, 1918) *ad loc*. This suggestion is not necessarily valid since the translator may have used an ancient manuscript even after the later manuscripts of MT had been written. Rofé, "Joshua 20" (see n. 32) dates the LXX to the end of the 5th–beginning of the 4th century.

C. Qumran

Chapter Twenty-Seven

The Special Character of the Texts Found in Qumran Cave 11

In cave 11 at Qumran, the remains of thirty-one different compositions have been found, among them the longest of the surviving Qumran scrolls, 11QTemple[a], as well as several very fragmentary texts. The biblical texts comprise two scrolls of Leviticus (11QpaleoLev[a] and 11QLev[b]), one of Deuteronomy (11QDeut), one of Ezekiel (11QEzek), five of Psalms (11QPs[a–e]), and a copy of the Targum of Job (11QtgJob), while the remaining twenty-one texts are nonbiblical. All the texts from this cave are included in *DJD* XXIII[1] except for two long compositions, 11QTemple[a] and 11QpaleoLev[a], published elsewhere.[2]

The evidence presented in this chapter suggests that the texts from this cave are more homogeneous with regard to their content than those found in the other caves. More specifically, the corpus of texts found in most caves cannot be characterized in any way, with the exception of cave 7.[3] We suggest that the collection of items in cave 11 reflect a common origin, being more sectarian, so to speak, than the contents of the other caves. It seems that the great majority of the texts from this cave were either copied according to the Qumran scribal practice, or were of interest to the Qumran community; in most cases, both conditions are met.

1. *Qumran scribal practice.* Most of the texts from cave 11 that are large enough for analysis were copied according to the Qumran scribal practice.[4] The characteristics of *all* the texts from cave 11, positive and negative, are tabulated as follows:

No.	Name	Qumran Scribal Practice	Sectarian Content	Notes
1	11QpaleoLev[a]	no	—	See group 4.
2	11QLev[b]	yes?	—	paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammaton
3	11QDeut	no data	—	
4	11QEzek	no	—	
5	11QPs[a] [5]	yes	yes?[6]	

[1] F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, *DJD* XXIII.

[2] Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, vols. 1–3 (Heb.; Jerusalem: IES, 1977); idem, *Temple Scroll*; D. N. Freedman and K. A. Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985).

[3] For details, see chapter 28*, n. 2.

[4] See *Scribal Practices*, 261–73.

No.	Name	Qumran Scribal Practice	Sectarian Content	Notes
6	11QPs^{b}	yes	—	
7	11QPs^{c}	yes	—	
8	11QPs^{d}	yes	—	
9	11QPs^{e}?	no data	—	
10	11QtgJob	irrelevant	—	
11	11QApocryphal Psalms	yes	no?	
12	11QJubilees + XQText A[7]	yes	yes?[8]	
13	11QMelchizedek	yes	yes	
14	11QSefer ha-Milḥamah	yes	yes	
15	11QHymns^{a}	no data	yes	
16	11QHymns^{b} + XQText B[9]	yes	yes	
17	11QShirot ʿOlat ha-Shabbat	no?	yes	
18	11QNew Jerusalem ar	irrelevant	no	
19	11QTemple^{a}	yes	yes?[10]	
20	11QTemple^{b}	yes	yes?	
21	11QTemple^{c}?	no data	yes?	
22	11QpaleoUnidentified Text	no data	no data	See group 4.
23	11QcryptA Unid. Text	no data	no data	See group 3.
24	11QUnidentified Text ar	irrelevant	no data	
25	11QUnidentified Text A	no data	no data	
26	11QUnidentified Text B	no data	no data	
27	11QUnidentified Text C	yes	no data	
28	11QpapUnidentified Text D	no data	no data	
29	11QFragment Related to Serekh ha-Yaḥad	no data	yes	
30	11QUnclassified Fragments	yes?	no data	
31	11QUnidentified Wads	no data	no data	

It is suggested with differing degrees of certainty that fourteen of the cave 11 texts had been copied according to the Qumran scribal practice. This group forms

[5] This text was published by J. A. Sanders, *DJD* IV. Additional fragments were published in *DJD* XXIII, 29–36.

[6] The sectarian nature of this scroll, probably serving as an early prayer book, is shown by the prose composition in col. XXVII. The listing of David's Psalms in this composition presupposes the Qumran calendrical system. For a discussion of the sectarian nature of this scroll, see the scholars mentioned in chapter 4*, n. 43.

[7] This fragment was published by S. Talmon as "XQText A (= 11QJub frg. 7a)" in *DJD* XXXVI. It was to be published differently, but at the last moment it was identified correctly by H. Eshel, "Three New Fragments from Cave 11," *Tarbiẓ* 68 (1999) 273–8.

[8] See n. 16 below. This composition, though not sectarian in the narrow sense of the word, had great influence on the Qumran community.

[9] This fragment was published by S. Talmon as "XQText B (= 11QHymns^{b} frg. 2)" in *DJD* XXXVI. This fragment was likewise identified correctly by H. Eshel (see n. 7).

[10] Many, if not most, scholars believe that this composition is sectarian. For a summary of the arguments, see F. García Martínez, "Temple Scroll," in *Encyclopedia DSS,* 2.930–31. If the present form of the work is not sectarian, it is at least close to the interests of the Qumran community,

a majority among the thirty-one texts, since nine other texts provide too little information on their system of Hebrew orthography and morphology (11Q3, 9, 15, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28, 29), while three Aramaic texts are irrelevant for such an analysis (11Q10, 18, 24). On the other hand, three other texts (11Q1, 4, 17) do not reflect the characteristics of the Qumran scribal practice. The main argument for ascribing a text to the Qumran scribal practice pertains to orthography and morphology, while several texts *additionally* exhibit scribal phenomena that within the Qumran corpus are characteristic of the Qumran scribal practice.[11] In the case of 11QLev[b] the main criterion for the assumption of the Qumran scribal practice is a scribal habit (writing of the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew letters) rather than morphology and orthography. If indeed F. García Martínez, E. Tigchelaar, and A. van der Woude are correct in assuming that 11QTemple[c]? (11Q21) and 11QJub (11Q12)[12] were written by the same hand, this would support our view to some extent.

The following fourteen texts were probably copied according to the Qumran scribal practice:

11QLev[b]: In this text, the Tetragrammaton is written in paleo-Hebrew, a phenomenon otherwise attested solely in 28 (29?) texts almost exclusively displaying the Qumran orthography and morphology.[13] The text is too short for orthographic analysis, but it contains one doubtful instance of כיא (frgs. 5 + 6 2), otherwise connected with the Qumran scribal practice.

11QPs[a–d]

11QApocryphal Psalms (11Q11)

11QJubilees (11Q12)

11QMelchizedek (11Q13)

11QSefer ha-Milḥamah (11Q14)

11QHymns[b] (11Q16) + XQText B[14]

11QTemple[a] (11Q19)

---

see L. Schiffman, "Utopia and Reality: Political Leadership and Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls Community," in Paul, *Emanuel,* 413–27.

[11] Cancellation dots in 11QPs[a] and 11QT[a], parenthesis signs in 11QpaleoLev[a], marks written at the ends of lines as a line-filler in 11QT[b] (11Q20) IV 9, writing of the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew letters in 11QPs[a].

[12] *DJD* XXIII, 411.

[13] See *Scribal Practices*, 261–73. With two or three exceptions, all these texts are written in the Qumran orthography and morphology. Since the texts written in the Qumran scribal practice form a minority within the Qumran corpus, the connection between the specific writing of the Tetragrammaton and the Qumran scribal practice is evident. A reverse examination of the texts written according to the Qumran scribal practice reveals that 36 texts did *not* use a special system for the writing of the divine names with paleo-Hebrew characters or *Tetrapuncta*. It therefore appears that within the Qumran scribal school different practices were employed for writing the divine names, possibly by different scribes or in different periods.

[14] In the analysis of the orthography, XQText B (*DJD* XXXVI) especially is taken into consideration. See n. 9 above.

11QTemple[b] (11Q20)

11QUnidentified Text C (11Q27)

11QUnclassified Fragments (11Q30) (too small for analysis, but frg. 10 reads כיא).

A remark on the statistical picture is in order. The analysis is based on the Qumran corpus containing fragments of 930 texts, from which 150 Aramaic and twenty-seven Greek texts were excluded, since they display no features comparable to the orthographic and morphological peculiarities recognized for the Hebrew. By the same token, at least another 150 items should be excluded due to their extremely fragmentary state. This leaves us with some 600 texts, of which 300–500 are large enough for analysis. Among these texts, 167 items are presumed on the basis of the mentioned criteria to have been copied according to the Qumran scribal practice (of these 167 texts, some 130 are good candidates, while the remainder are probable candidates). It cannot be coincidental that the great majority of the sectarian texts were copied, admittedly somewhat inconsistently, in a common orthographical and morphological style and with common scribal features; rather, the only plausible conclusion seems to be that the sectarian scribes used set scribal conventions. This group of sectarian texts represents probably one third or half of the Qumran texts.

2. *Sectarian content and terminology.* While the nature of the Qumran community will remain controversial, it espoused specific ideas and a terminology of its own. The group has often been described as a sect, and hence its ideas and terminology have been dubbed "sectarian." On the basis of these two criteria, D. Dimant has composed a list of the presumably sectarian writings found at Qumran[15] that is followed in our listing of the sectarian writings in cave 11. The case of Jubilees is a special one as the community had a close affiliation to this work.[16] In most cases, these sectarian texts were also copied according to the Qumran scribal practice (denoted below as "Qu"), but in some cases insufficient evidence is available:

11QPs[a]? (11Q5) (Qu)

11QJubilees (11Q12) (probably) (Qu)

11QMelchizedek (11Q13) (Qu)

11QSefer ha-Milḥamah (11Q14) (Qu)

---

[15] D. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *A Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness. Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995) 23–58. When that study was written, not all the Qumran compositions were known.

[16] Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts," 28 distinguishes between works composed by the community and works written outside the community such as Jubilees and 1 Enoch sharing religious ideas and concepts with the Qumran sectarian literature. Works of the latter type may have influenced the community and were definitely cherished by the Qumran community as shown also by their relatively large representation in the corpus.

11QHymns[a] (11Q15)
11QHymns[b] (11Q16) (Qu)
11QShirot ʿOlat ha-Shabbat (11Q17)
11QTemple[a] (11Q19) (Qu)
11QTemple[b] (11Q20) (Qu)
11QTemple[c]*?* (11Q21)
11QFragment Related to Serekh ha-Yaḥad (11Q29)

Since eleven of the twenty-two nonbiblical texts are sectarian, they comprise a large group, taking into consideration that for seven additional texts insufficient data are available and three texts are in Aramaic (there is no proof that the Qumran community wrote in any language other than Hebrew).[17] The data registered in this section run parallel to the previous one, providing a different outlook on more or less the same texts. To be precise, seven of the eleven sectarian texts listed here are also recorded in the previous paragraph. The four *sectarian* texts for which there was insufficient proof for a link with the Qumran scribal practice (indicated by *italics*: 11Q15, 17, 21, 29), may now be added to the fourteen texts mentioned in section 1.

3. *A Cryptic text.* A single fragment written in the cryptic A script was probably written by the Qumran community:

11QcryptA Unidentified Text (11Q23)

This script, described by S. Pfann, "4Q298" as a development from the Late Phoenician scripts, was used for several texts of a Qumran sectarian nature (4Q249, 249a–i, 298, 317) as well as for other texts which may have had a special meaning for the Qumran community.[18] According to Milik, quoted by Pfann, ibid., and Pfann this script was used especially by the Maskil.

4. *Texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script*. Two texts completely written in the paleo-Hebrew script, one very fragmentary, *may* have been linked to the Qumran community:

11QpaleoLev[a]

11QpaleoUnidentified Text (11Q22). In this text, לאלהיכ was written with a different ink color (red?), implying either the use of a different pen or the involvement of a different scribe, or both.[19] If indeed this word was written with a different pen, this would be the only instance of the special treatment of a divine name in a text completely written in paleo-Hebrew characters

The background of the writing of complete scrolls in the paleo-Hebrew script remains unknown. It has been suggested cautiously that these texts were written

[17] See Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts," 34.
[18] See Pfann, "The Writings in Esoteric Script from Qumran," in Schiffman, *Jerusalem Congress*, 177–90.
[19] The fragment itself could not be located, and the photograph remains our only source.

by the Sadducees,[20] a community from which the Essenes may have branched off.

In short, the special sectarian nature of the thirty-one texts found in cave 4 is based on the following evidence:

14 texts copied according to the Qumran scribal practice (most of which reflect the ideas and terminology of the Qumran community).

4 texts, for which insufficient proof is available regarding their orthography and morphology, reflect sectarian ideas and terminology.

1 text written in the cryptic A script, possibly linked to the Qumran community.

2 texts completely written in the paleo-Hebrew script, possibly connected with the Sadducees, from which the Essenes may have branched off.

The link with the Qumran community seems convincing, since the remaining texts from cave 11 are either written in Aramaic (**3**), a language in which the Qumran community is not known to have written, or are too small for analysis (**7**, viz., 11Q3, 4, 9, 25, 26, 28, 31). Within the latter group, 4Q4 (4QEzekiel) is not written in the Qumran scribal practice.

The collection of texts found in cave 11 must have come as a whole from the Qumran community itself, possibly from a specific location. In this collection some special material features are recognizable as well:

1. It is probably no coincidence that for a large percentage of the texts from cave 11 (six of the twenty-one texts from that cave,[21] disregarding the small unidentified fragments), one of the two extremities has been preserved, in this case always the ending. This implies relatively favorable storage conditions in that cave, as described in detail in chapter 9, § 4c.

2. Among the texts preserving a separate (ruled or unruled) uninscribed handle sheet (protective sheet, ἐσχατοκόλλιον) stitched after the last inscribed sheet, the high frequency of scrolls from cave 11 is striking. In several instances, the handle sheet is still attached. Among the Qumran scrolls for which the ending is known this system is the exception rather than the rule. In most cases, an uninscribed area was left at the end of the scroll without a protective handle sheet.[22] Among the seven scrolls for which such a final sheet is either extant or reconstructed, four were found in cave 11,[23] while the other three were found in cave 4,[24] a cave preserving twenty times more texts than cave 11. It is also noteworthy

---

[20] *Scribal Practices,* 247–8.

[21] 11QpaleoLev^{a}, 11QPs^{a}, 11QtgJob, 11QapocrPs (11Q11), 11QShirShabb (11Q17), 11QT^{a} (11Q19).

[22] 1QpHab; 4QDeut^{q}; 4QJudg^{b}; 4QpsDan^{c} ar (4Q245); 4QD^{a} (4Q266); 4QD^{e} (4Q270) 7; 4QMish H (4Q329a); 4QOrdo (4Q334) 7; 4QMMT^{f} (4Q399); 4QHod.-like Text C (4Q440) 3; 4QShir^{b} (4Q511) 63; 11QPs^{a}; 11QtgJob. Often the straight vertical edge of the scroll has been preserved, but in a few cases such evidence is lacking. The system of 1QH^{b} (1Q35) 2 is unclear.

[23] 11QpaleoLev^{a}, 11QapocrPs (11Q11), 11QShirShabb (11Q17), 11QT^{a} (11Q19).

[24] 1QS, 1QSa, 4QD^{d} (4Q269) frg. 16.

that all the Qumran texts in this group (from both caves) were copied according to the Qumran scribal practice. The preservation of such a large number of ends of scrolls shows favorable storage conditions in cave 11, while the preponderance of handle sheets among the cave 11 scrolls reflects a specific type of preparation or treatment of the scrolls.

3. "Some of the manuscripts from Cave 11 were of especially fine, thin leather, others of coarse leather."[25] While 11QT[a] (11Q19) is one of the finest scrolls from Qumran, study of the Qumran leather samples is not advanced enough to make any statement beyond mere impressions.

A strong sectarian connection of the fragments from cave 11, stronger than that of the other caves, together with the preponderance of handle sheets among the cave 11 texts characterize the contents of this cave. These characteristics suggest that the collection of texts found in cave 11 must have come as a whole from the Qumran community itself, possibly brought from a specific location.

[25] Stegemann, *Library,* 78.

Chapter Twenty-Eight

The Number of Manuscripts and Compositions Found at Qumran

1. Total Number of the Qumran Manuscripts

Following the near-completion of the texts from the Judean Desert, their overall number can now be assessed, on the basis of the most recent list of the Qumran texts,[1] thus advancing our understanding of the nature and scope of the Qumran corpus. In this calculation, no special attention is paid to the exact find-site of these texts in the various caves (see Table 1), because the few conclusions to be drawn regarding the distinctive character of the collections found in the individual caves are irrelevant to the present analysis.[2]

The analysis below pertains to Qumran texts written in all languages and scripts, but excludes the three ostraca found at Qumran.[3] The majority of the texts are penned in the square script in Hebrew on leather. Details regarding other groups (papyri, texts written in Aramaic, Nabatean-Aramaic, Greek, the paleo-Hebrew script, and in one of the cryptic scripts) are provided in *DJD* XXXIX (see n. 1 and p. 339 above).

---

[1] *DJD* XXXIX, 27–113 ("List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," by E. Tov with the collaboration of S. J. Pfann).

[2] The only characteristics of the individual caves seem to be: (1) Cave 7 contains only Greek papyrus fragments (19 items), probably mainly biblical texts. (2) Most of the texts from cave 6 are Hebrew papyri (21 papyri out of a total of 31 items), including a few biblical papyri. This collection of texts must have derived from a special source, different from that of the main depository of texts in cave 4. (3) The collection of texts from cave 4, by far the largest among the different caves, probably constituted the main collection of the Qumran community, as no compositions (as opposed to manuscripts) were found in caves 1–3 and 5–11 which were not matched by cave 4 copies. (4) A large percentage of the identifiable texts from cave 11 reflect the Qumran scribal system or are sectarian. See chapter 27*.

[3] Included, too, are 17 "Qumran" documents which may have derived from other sites. See A. Yardeni, *DJD* XXVII, 283–317.

Table 1: The Number of Manuscripts (Biblical and Nonbiblical) Found in the Qumran Caves

Cave	*No. of Manuscripts*	Notes
1	80 (72 + 8 supra-numeral texts)	This total is based on the inventory mentioned in n. 1. For cave 1, that list mentions 72 items and eight additional (supranumeral) texts. These additional texts consist of two groups: (1) texts such as 1QpHab, which were never given an inventory number and (2) supranumeral texts such as that published as 1Q70bis.
2	33	
3	15	
4	681 This total includes 570 items + 122 supranumeral texts totaling 692, from which eleven items have been deducted (see the "Notes").[4]	The final inventory list in *DJD* XXXIX contains eleven items, such as 4Q335–336, reflecting identifications by J. T. Milik appearing in earlier lists, which could not be identified on the photographs. These items can now safely be deducted from the overall number of texts, as they are probably covered by compositions added in recent years as supranumeral inventory items (e. g., 4Q468a–d). The number of texts listed here for cave 4 (570) actually reflects 582 inventory numbers, from which twelve opisthographs have been deducted. See remark 6 below.
5	25	
6	33	
7	19	
8	5	
9	1	
10	—	
11	31	
Unid. Caves	6	

These calculations pertain only to the number of manuscripts actually found in the caves, with no reference to the number of scrolls once deposited therein; there are no clues available from which to deduce the number of scrolls originally deposited in the caves.[5] Calculations of the number of texts found at Qumran

[4] On the other hand, in 1993, H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus, Ein Sachbuch* (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1993) 18 counted 566 scrolls for cave 4. This number was repeated in the English translation, *Library*, 8.

[5] The only possible clue for the number of the texts deposited in any one cave pertains to cave 8. In that cave, archeologists discovered sixty-eight reinforcing tabs, usually of coarse leather, meant to be tied around the scrolls, together with remains of only five manuscripts. Since each reinforcing tab was once attached to a scroll, this cave may have contained an equal number of scrolls and reinforcing tabs while many of the former subsequently disintegrated. In the latter case, sixty-three manuscripts would have perished in that cave. It is more likely, however, that the cave contained a leather workshop or depository. On the whole, it seems that there is no basis for any estimates of the number of scrolls once deposited in the caves. The literature does,

cannot be objective, since several aspects of the counting are open to different interpretations.

1. It is often unclear whether two or more fragments derived from the same or different scrolls (or whether three fragments reflect one, two, or three different scrolls, etc.).[6] These and similar doubts are disregarded in the calculations.

2. Because of the fragmentary condition of the papyrus and leather fragments, the total number of compositions preserved will never be known. Our own calculations follow the insights of the scholars who published the texts. In the case of the Qumran papyri, some scholars combined many or possibly too many fragments to form a single item, while others designated almost every individual fragment as a separate composition. Thus, such single inventory items as 1Q69 and 1Q70, both named "1QpapUnclassified Fragments," possibly represent many more texts than these two numbers suggest. Conversely, many minute fragments written in the cryptic A script were presented by S. J. Pfann in *DJD* XXXVI as fifty-four individual texts (4Q249–249z, 250–250j, 298, 313–313c, 317, 324–324i, 362–363b), while they probably represent a much smaller number of manuscripts.

3. In the final publication of 4Q451–582 by É. Puech (*DJD* XXXVII) slight deviations from the previous calculations of these texts may occur. In the meantime, the present calculation of these texts is based on the inventory list in *DJD* XXXIX (see n. 1) and on their temporary publication.[7]

4. The hitherto unidentified fragments published in *DJD* XXXIII together with the unidentified fragments presented in earlier *DJD* volumes are not included in the present calculation as independent entities. It stands to reason that most of them derived from manuscripts published elsewhere, so that they need not be counted separately.

5. The calculations do not refer to a few Qumran manuscripts, which reportedly surfaced recently.[8]

6. In the inventory in *DJD* XXXIX, twelve opisthographs (that is, texts inscribed on both sides) containing two different compositions on the *recto* and *verso* have separate inventory numbers (e. g., 4Q201 and 4Q338; 4Q415 and 4Q414). These items, together with opisthographs containing the same text on both sides (e. g., 4Q250a; 4Q342) are counted only once. As a result, twelve such items are deducted from the total number of Qumran texts found in cave 4 (see Table 1).

---

however, contain an estimate, since according to H. Stegemann, the number of such texts was 1000: *Die Essener*, 115 = *Library*, 79.

[6] See chapter 10*, § 1. By the same token, are 4QJer^{b,d,e} indeed three manuscripts as was claimed by Tov, *DJD* XV, 171–6, 203–7 and are the Deuteronomy and Exodus segments of 4QDeut^{j} indeed part of the same manuscript as was claimed by J. A. Duncan in *DJD* XIV, 75–91.

[7] D. W. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004–2005).

[8] See chapter 10*, n. 7.

As a result of these and several similar problems, the totals for the manuscripts of the biblical books are only approximate. Taking these difficulties into account and accepting the challenge that all calculations are subjective, we count **929** different manuscripts at Qumran, in twelve cases involving manuscripts containing in addition to the text on the *recto* a different text on their *verso*. Some of the Qumran texts are long or even very long, such as 1QIsa[a] and 11QT[a]. Others comprised one-sheet compositions, such as 4QTest (4Q175) and personal notes such as 4QList of False Prophets ar (4Q339) and 4QList of Netinim (4Q340) that were written on very small irregularly shaped scraps of leather.

Calculations made one or two generations ago totaled 600 Qumran manuscripts, a number that has grown in our imagination to 700, 800,[9] 900,[10] and now **929**. Early calculations were based on mere estimates, while in recent years they have been based on inventory lists.

It remains impossible to calculate the number of the scrolls originally deposited in the caves (see n. 5). The fact that the remains of the scrolls probably average a mere 5–10% of the surface of all the compositions found at Qumran does not help us in this regard. One could argue on the basis of this percentage that no more than 5–10% of all scrolls have survived, but as the chances of survival depended on the conditions of the various locations in the caves, it would be difficult to make any calculations. But it does stand to reason that a sizeable number of small compositions could have been lost.

2. Number of Qumran Compositions Excluding Multiple Copies

In the counting of the Qumran texts, a basic distinction is made between manuscripts/texts on the one hand and compositions on the other. The Qumran collection is composed of a large number of large and small scroll fragments, which scholars have sorted and combined into a much smaller number of reconstructed individual texts (manuscripts). Each text (manuscript) is a unicum that is provided with a separate inventory number, such as the long scroll 11QT[a] (the main copy of the Temple Scroll) or 4QJer[e], a minute fragment of Jeremiah, which probably represents the only remaining fragment of that scroll. Viewed differently, the various manuscripts (texts) represent copies of a smaller number of compositions, such as the Temple Scroll represented by four copies or the book of Psalms represented by thirty-six different copies. Certain conventions have been developed in the nomenclature of the texts, but the very concept of what

[9] E. g., Stegemann, *Die Essener*, 115 = idem, *Library*, 79; Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts," 22–58, especially 30, 35.

[10] Thus most publications in the 1990s.

constitutes a copy of a certain composition (as opposed to a related or separate composition) is far from clear.[11] In the present analysis we do not express a view on the acceptable range of divergence between the various copies of a composition; we merely follow the lead of earlier scholars who in their editions reflect a certain view on the nature of these compositions and their multiple copies. By so doing, we accept that any decision on determining what constitutes a composition, and what is acceptable for a text to be considered a copy of that composition, is subjective.

In the publication system followed in *DJD*, multiple copies of the same composition are denoted with small raised letters such as 4QGen[a], 4QGen[b], etc. At the same time, when two manuscripts are somewhat more divergent, yet not sufficiently so to be considered separate compositions, they are often described as belonging to the same circle, indicated with capital letters, such as 4QMishmarot A, B, etc. The criteria for the differentiation between the two different systems of presentation have never been formulated, and, frankly, it would be very difficult to do so. The procedure employed would probably differ from one literary genre to the next, and could never be spelled out well because of the fragmentary nature of the evidence. We therefore have to content ourselves with describing the decisions of editors. Three different types of relations are reflected by the present nomenclature:

(1) independent compositions;

(2) compositions belonging to the same (literary) circle indicated with capital letters, such as 4QapocrJeremiah A, B, etc.;

(3) copies of single compositions, such as 4QpsEzek[a,b,c].

The distinction between these three types of presentation is difficult, and has been executed differently and inconsistently over the course of the publication process. But in spite of the subjectivity involved, the editor's intentions regarding the status of the text are clear, so that we usually know which texts were conceived of as independent compositions, and which as copies of a given composition. But problems remain (see remark 5 below), exemplified by *DJD* XXX.[12]

---

[11] Scholars espouse different opinions on the range of differences between the copies of the same composition acceptable within the framework of what was supposedly a single composition. Usually a large range of divergence between the various copies was considered acceptable on the basis of the assumption that in antiquity greatly diverging forms or recensions of the same composition could have been circulating. Thus the thirty-six Qumran copies of the book of Psalms differ in major aspects, as some of them are almost identical to the medieval Masoretic Psalter, while others present the Psalms in a different sequence, with Masoretic Psalms missing, and noncanonical Psalms added. Some scholars would probably say that there is evidence for at least two different books of Psalms, at least one constituting a prayer book of the Qumran community. However, these different views are not reflected in the nomenclature, since all these compositions are named 'Psalms', such as "1QPs," "2QPs," etc. For a discussion of the different Qumran Psalms scrolls, see chapter 4*, § 2j.

[12] In this volume one group of texts is presented as multiple copies of a single composition, 4QpseudoEzekiel (4QpsEzek[a–e] [4Q385, 386, 385b, 388, 391]; 4QpsEzek: Unid Frags. [4Q385c]),

When turning our attention to the Qumran compositions, we note that the number of individual compositions reflected in the Qumran corpus is much smaller than that of the individual manuscripts (texts), as many of them are represented by multiple copies. The number of Qumran manuscripts listed above (929), based on the evaluations by scholars of the nature and extent of individual manuscripts, gives a subjective indication of the number of manuscripts surviving after 2000 years. These manuscripts can now be subdivided into groups of multiple copies of the same composition and the result of such a calculation provides a subjective impression of the number of independent compositions represented in the Qumran corpus. As independent compositions, we describe all the Qumran texts that have not been indicated by raised numbers, as these raised numbers indicate multiple copies. Among the independent copies are also included the semi-independent texts of the type of 4QMishmarot A, B, etc.

Such a calculation, presented in Table 2, temporarily removes from the counting all multiple copies of a given composition.[13] The result of such a calculation is a list of all the Qumran compositions of which at least one copy was found in the Qumran caves. For the sake of objectivity, unidentified fragments are included in the counting as a separate group.

The calculation of the number of *independent Qumran compositions* (not including multiple copies) is based on all fragments whose character has been expressed in their name. *Grosso modo* this list contains all the Qumran fragments bearing an identifying name (including such items as 4QFragment Mentioning a Court [4Q440b]), while the unidentified fragments are included as a separate group. This counting could have been based on a list of the raw data included in *DJD* XXXIX, but is more convincing on the basis of the classified list of the Qumran documents presented in the same volume.[14] In this list, the 929 items found in the Qumran caves are subdivided into thirteen different content categories represented in Table 2 below. The advantage of listing the Qumran compositions in this way is that we can easily see the scope of the different categories of compositions. Its drawback is that some individual compositions are listed two or three times in the analysis of Lange-Mittmann, since the categorization of individual texts cannot always be narrowed down to a single literary genre. As a result, the overall number of Qumran compositions cannot be determined simply by adding up the figures in the second column, but certain adaptations have to be made on the basis of the remarks in col. 3.

---

while a similar group of texts is presented as a literary circle also involving multiple copies of the same composition, 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah: 4QapocrJer A (4Q383), 4Qpap apocrJer B? (4Q384), 4QapocrJer C^{a-f} (4Q385a, 387, 388a 389–390, 387a).

[13] In the example of the six items mentioned above, 4QpseudoEzekiel (4QpsEzek^{a-e} [4Q385, 386, 385b, 388, 391]; 4QpsEzek: Unid Frags. [4Q385c]) is counted as a single composition.).

[14] A. Lange with U. Mittmann-Richert, "Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre," *DJD* XXXIX, 115–64.

The classification of Lange-Mittmann refers only to texts or fragments that they consider large enough for a characterization of their content. It therefore disregards 83 very fragmentary pieces listed in category 14.1, which in spite of the fact that they contain such names as 1QApocryphal Prophecy (1Q25), 1QHymnic Composition? (1Q37), cannot be characterized satisfactorily.[15] These 83 fragments are taken into consideration below, together with other unidentified fragments.

Table 2: The Number of Nonbiblical and Biblical Compositions Found in the Qumran Caves Subdivided by Content Category

	Overall Section Total	*No. of Compositions Also Appearing Under Other Headings*[16]							
		1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.9
1.1 Parabiblical Texts	49			3	1*			10*	
1.2 Exegetical Texts	28			1				1	
1.3 Religious Law	22	3	1					2	
1.4 Calendrical Texts	33	1*				1		1*	1
1.5 Poetic & Liturgical Texts	56/57				1		1	2	6
1.6 Sapiential Texts	18					1			
1.7 Historical Texts & Tales	7								
1.8 Apocalyptic & Eschatological Texts	27	10*	1	2	1*	2			
1.9 Magic & Divination	10				1	6			
1.10 Documentary Texts	17								
1.11 Treasure List	1								
1.12 Letters	2								
1.13 Scribal Exercises	4								
Total	274/5								
To be deducted: 26 compositions appearing twice and one composition appearing three times in the list.	28								

[15] In the words of Lange-Mittmann (p. 145, n. 87): "While the manuscripts listed below often preserve enough text to provide a general description, their fragmentary state does not allow for any further conclusions. Thus, 5Q10 is named 5QapocrMal but the fact that Mal 1:13–14 is quoted or alluded to in this manuscript does not mean that the unpreserved text of the manuscript contained any references to the book of Malachi. Another example is 1QHymnic Composition? (1Q37). While a hymnic style can certainly be found in the few preserved fragments, it is impossible to conclude that this manuscript attests a collection of hymns. It could also be part of a sapiential composition which includes a creation hymn or a halakhic liturgical prescription like 1QS I 18–II 25."

[16] These numbers refer to the classification by Lange-Mittmann in *DJD* XXXIX.

	Overall Section Total	*No. of Compositions Also Appearing Under Other Headings*
Sum Total: Nonbiblical Compositions	246/7	
Total: Biblical Books[17]	23	
Total: Biblical Translations and Semi-Biblical Compositions[18]	30	
Sum Total: Biblical Compositions	53	
Overall Total: Qumran Compositions	299/300	
1.14 Unclassified Fragments	?[19]	

The data in this table present the number of compositions found in the Qumran caves, pertaining to both the nonbiblical and biblical compositions.

Remarks

1. The calculation of the number of independent compositions is based on the list of Lange-Mittmann in *DJD* XXXIX, the logic of which is clarified here. In sections 1.1 and 1.2 of the list, the names of the compositions are given first, followed (after an *indentation*) by the specific Qumran texts that represent each composition. For example, the composition named Apocryphon of Joshua (see chapter 7* above) is represented by the following Qumran texts: 4QapocrJosh$^{a–b}$, 4QProphecy of Joshua, 5QWork with Place Names, as well as by Mas apocrJosh (p. 126). According to the logic of that list, all these texts are counted as a single composition, Apocryphon of Joshua. In sections 1.3 onwards, the names of compositions and texts are presented differently, but the listing follows the same principle. For example, according to Lange-Mittmann (p. 142), the eleven texts listed for the War Rule, among which are 4QWar Scroll-like Text B (4Q471), 1QM, 4QpapM^{f}, and 4QSefer ha-Milḥamah (4Q285, 11Q14), all reflect a single composition.

[17] For the sake of convention, the books of Hebrew Scripture (not including the book of Esther) are recorded anachronistically according to their subsequent canonical status.

[18] The list of biblical compositions is augmented by the following related material (without considering multiple copies): Phylacteries (1), Mezuzot (1), Targum (3), LXX (6 + 19 [cave 7]?).

[19] See the analysis below.

2. According to Lange-Mittmann, 4QNon-Canonical Psalms A and B, listed in section 1.5.2.3, may represent either one or two compositions. This uncertainty is reflected in the overall number of 56–57 compositions for section 1.5.

3. The four items in 1.15 "Manuscripts Not included in This List" (4Q123, 158, 168, 365a) are not included in the calculation, as we follow the logic of that list. According to Lange-Mittmann, 4Q123 (4Qpaleo paraJosh), 4Q158 (4QRP^{a}), 4Q168 (4QpMic?) are biblical, and 4Q365a is part of the same manuscript as 4Q365.

4. One composition (1 Enoch 72–82) appears under three different headings (1.1, 1.4, 1.8) and is marked with an asterisk in the table. All other compositions listed under the heading "No. of Compositions Also Appearing Under Other Headings" appear in two sections.

5. Ninety-six texts in sections 1.1–1.13 are given names denoting a special literary circle, such as 4QApocrPent A, B in which the capital letters A, B (as opposed to small raised characters such as 4QEnoch^{a,b}) indicate their semi-independent status. Terminology of this type is subjective (see above), and on the basis of the assumption that some of these texts may nevertheless be divergent copies of the same composition, the number of *independent* compositions is probably smaller than indicated by the sum total of 246/7 non-biblical compositions.

6. On the other hand, some of the 83 very fragmentary pieces listed in category 1.14 and disregarded in the classification may reflect some Qumran compositions for which these are the only surviving fragments. This may also be the case for the even more fragmentary pieces mentioned in category 14.2 as well as for the unidentified fragments published in *DJD* XXXIII. Also the semi-biblical compositions are likely to comprise less than the figure provided (30), for which see n. 18.

The total number of independent compositions found at Qumran is listed as **299–300**. From this number one has to deduct:

1. An unknown number of the 96 texts that have been presented as semi-independent, while actually they may be copies of other compositions.

2. An unknown number of fragments that have been wrongly presented as independent, while they are actually copies of other, known, Qumran compositions.

3. An unknown number of the semi-biblical Greek compositions (see n. 18).

4. A great percentage of the texts in the cryptic scripts, now presented as 54 different items.

To this number one has to add:

Small fragments such as the material presented in the list of Lange-Mittmann (14.1 and 14.2), altogether 175 items, together with the fragments published in *DJD* XXXIII, some of which may present the only evidence for otherwise unknown Qumran texts.

Owing to the lack of clarity described above, it may be safe to work with the assumption of **300** independent compositions found at Qumran,[20] each of which has an average of 2.0 copies. Many of these texts are represented by single copies, while for others as many as ten, twenty, or even 36 copies (Psalms) are known. On the whole, the average number of copies for the biblical texts (7.7 copies per composition) is much higher than for the nonbiblical texts.[21]

[20] Because of the numbers to be deducted from the overall figure, probably the real figure is likely to be smaller than 300, possibly no more than **250**.

[21] The calculation, based on the data provided in *DJD* XXXIX, 165–84, pertains to all the biblical books except for Esther (the Minor Prophets are counted as one book).

Ancient Sources

1. Hebrew Scripture

a. Masoretic Text

Genesis
1–11 281
1:9 224
3:1–12 *21*
9:21 *203*
11 61
12:4–5 21
12:6 *60*
17:1 373
26:18 5
30:25 *248*
31:55 *248*
33:18–20 *60*
38 215
48:20 *98*

Exodus
5:7 *396*
6 9
7–11 61, 62, 302
12 30
12:43 31, 32, *32*, 39
13:1–10 30, 31
13:1–5 39
13:3–5 38, 39
13:11–16 30
13:15–16 33, 39
13:16 33
13:17–22 33
14 33
15:1 33, 39
18 *66*
18:24–25 65
18:24 *66–67*
18:25a 68
18:25b *66*
19:21 *66*
20 31
20:11 32
20:21 29, *30*
24 216
25–30 8
32:10 62
35–40 8, 284

Leviticus
9:2–3 *177*
9:9 *177*
16:21
17 18
17:3 *18*
17:13 *19*
23:13 *203*
23:27–29 20
26:42 12

Numbers
1:2–24 5
1:26–32 5
1:36–42 5
9:22 9
10:10 *63,* 67, *68*
10:11–12 67
12:16b *66*, *67*
13:33b 66
14 66
14:40b *66*
14:41a *63*
14:42 *63*
21:32 75
24:15–17 30
27:18–23 83
32:28 83
32:39 75
34:17 83

Deuteronomy
1–3 61–66, 84, 162
1:6–8 *63*, 67
1:9–18 65, *66*, 68

1:9 *67*
1:13 *66*
1:20–23a *66*
1:23 *67*
1:27–33 *66*
1:42 *63*, *66*
2:1–5 65
2:2–6 65
2:7 65
3:23–26 68
4–11 62
4:34 382
5–6 31
5 30, 31, 33, 39
5:1–6 1, 32, 39
5:15 32
5:19–30 62
5:28–29 *30*
5:29–30 153
6 30, 31, 39
6:4–9 30
6:9 *200*
8 31, *32*, 39
8:5–10 32, 39
9:20 62
10–11 31
10 30, 31
11 30, 31, 33, 39
11:1 272
11:13–21 30, *32*
11:29a *60*
11:30 *60*
12–26 17–20
12 17–20
12:1–12 18–20
12:5 *60*
12:14 *60*
12:20–25 *19*
12:20–21 *18*
13 31
14:24 *18*
14:29 272
17–19 216
17:18 *206*
18:15–22 62
18:18–22 *67*
18:18–19 *30*
19:7 *18*
19:8–10 *8*
20:17 *67*
20:18b *67*
21 216
22:5 216
23:12 273
23:19 216
25:13–16a 216
27:2b–3a *60*
27:4 *60*, *159*
27:5–7 *60*
28–31 84
28–30 216
28:15 272
30:17–18 *32*
32 30, 31, 33, 39, 40, 58
32:37–43 33
32:46–47 172
33 27
33:8–11 30, *139*, 140
33:17–24 172
34:2–6 172

Joshua 217
1:1 402
1:7 402
1:11 402
1:15 403
5:1 163
5:14–15 76
8:30–35 163, 217
8:31 403
8:34 403
9:7 *203*
11:1 79
12:19 79
15:3 79
18:1 76, *77*
20 169, 404
21 142
21:25 79
23:16b 403
24:17 403

Judges 8, 217
1:15 80
1:21 81
1:27 80
1:34–35 80
2:1 83
6:7–10 *400*
17:2 *204*
20 83
20:26–28 83

Samuel-Kings 8

1 Samuel
1:23 *102*
2:9 *203*
9:3 61, 302
10 100
10:25 220
13:3 318
16–18 283

2 Samuel
5:2 *203*
5:6–9 75
5:7 75
6:1 *396*
7 27
7:1 78
12:24–25 76
14–15 146
15:24–37 76
19:6 396
22 8
24:18–24 75
24:25 76

1–2 Kings 169

1 Kings 285–305
2:12 *290*
2:35 *159*
3:1 288
5:7–8 288
5:17 75
5:19 75
5:20 75
5:31–32 288
6:11–14 406
6:37–38 288
8:11–12 289
8:17 75
8:20 75
9:9 407
9:15–22 289
9:16–17 288
9:24 288
11:26 86
12:24 287
12:31 *159*
16:34 82, 409
20:10–20 169
22:41–51 288
22:49 *204*

2 Kings
17:29 *159*
17:32 *159*, 410
20:4 203
22 *181*
22:8 220
23:2 220
23:24–27 *159*
23:24 220
34:1–4 *159*

Isaiah
1–34 49, 55
2:22 *139*
8:4–11 48
20:2 *98*
23:8–24:15 *55*
25:2 *98*
26:4 55
32:1 *98*
34:1–36:2 49
34:17b–35:2 *211*
35–66 49, 55
37:4b–7 *211*
37:31 396
38:13 *53*
38:21–22 55
38:21 50, *211*
40:7 50, *211*
40:14a–16 *211*
40:14 50
44:5 55
45:7 48
50:7–51:10 52
51:15 55
52:10 55
53:11 53, 54
55:5 55
57:11 13
60:19–20 *53*

Jeremiah 410–14
7:30–8:3 *211*
23:17 260
23:33 *257*
28:16 413
30:18 12
33:26 12
36:23 *206*
39 *162*
46:27 12
51:19 12
52 *162*

Ezekiel
10:5–15 37
10:17–11:11 37
13:24 *248*
23:14–18 37
23:44–47 37
41:3–6 37

Jonah
2 215

Habakkuk
1:2–4 *214*
1:12–13 *214*
1:15 396
2:5 *137*
2:15 *137*
3:18–19 *214*

Haggai
1:8 *203*

Psalms
18 8
18:48 379
32 *36*
42–83 209, 216
47:4 379
90–150 36
91–94 38
99–100 38
102–103 38
103 117
104 133
112–113 38
116–118 38
119 33, 40, 133
122 85
145 37, *153*

Ruth
1:8 258
3:14 257

Canticles
1:3 194
1:10 262
2:14 *193*
2:17 262
3:6–8 34
3:6 262
4:3 35
4:4–7 34, 35
4:7–6:11 34
4:7 35
4:8–6:10 35
4:12 *193*
5:1 34
6:10 35
6:11 35
7:7 *193*
7:10 *193*

Qohelet
1:17 197
12:5 197

Lamentations
1:1 133

Esther
1:1 258, 260
1:4 263
3:5 *260*
3:13 260
4:17 260
6:4 *260*
6:5 *260*
6:13 *260*
8:17 258

Daniel
3:31–33 298
4–6 283

Nehemiah
11 169

1–2 Chronicles
8 9

1 Chronicles
1:10–16 17b–23
2:47–49 *162*
4:16–18 *162*
4:34–37 *162*
7:34–38 *162*
8:17–22 *162*
21:18–22 75
22:4 75
22:5 76
22:6 75

2 Chronicles
3:1 75
4:2 7

6:9 76
8:18 *203*
19:8 *181*
34 *181*
34:15 220
34:30 220
35:19 *159*
36:2 5, *159*

Aleppo codex (A) 4, 11, 12

Leningrad codex
B19^{A} (L) 4, 11, 12, 53, 54, 176

b. Samaritan Pentateuch

47, 57–70, 158, 162, 163, 168, 271–82, 300–305, 354–64, 382
Exod 20 163
Deut 5 163
Deut 11:30 *187*

2. Judean Desert Texts

The texts are arranged by site and cave.

a. Hebrew/Aramaic Scripture

1QpaleoLev 142
1QpaleoNum 142
1QDeut^{a} 151
1QDeut^{b} 275
1QDeut^{c} 151
1QSam 152
1QJudg *130*
1QIsa^{a} 29, 42–56, 108–9, 111, 115, 120–26, 129, 130, 132, 133, 138–40, 143, 146, *147*, 152, 154, 164, 173, 181, *200*, 201, *201*, *210*, *211*, 221–7, 396
1QIsa^{b} 42–56, 109, 129, 132, 139, 146, *147*, 201, *201*, 221–7
1QPs^{a} *33*, 133

2QExod^{b} 23, 28, *69*, *131*, 149
2QpaleoLev 109, 142
2QNum^{b} 151, 152
2QDeut^{c} 151
2QJer 52, 139, 152, 223
2QPs 117

4QGen-Exod^{a} 109, 132
4QpaleoGen-Exod^{l} 109, 132, 142
4QGen^{b} *53*, 123, 132, 133, 151
4QGen^{d} 133
4QGen^{e} 132, 133
4QGen^{f} 130, 133
4QGen^{g} 132, 133
4QGen^{h1} 129
4QGen^{h2} 129
4QGen$^{h\text{-}para}$ 22, 23
4QGen$^{h\text{-}title}$ (4Q8c) 124
4QGen^{k} 22, 23, 132, 224
4QpaleoGen^{m} 142
4QGen^{n} 22, *129*
4QpapGen (4Q483) 130
4QExod-Lev^{f} 61, 117, 132, 147, *166*
4QExod^{b} 132, 133, 148
4QExod^{d} 23, 33, 34, 38, 39, 149, 165, *166*
4QExod^{e} 38, 39, 132, 133
4QExod^{j} 151
4QpaleoExod^{m} 57–70, 109, 117, 124, 132, 142, 147, 162, *300*, *302*
4QLev-Num^{a} 132
4QLev^{c} 133
4QLev^{d} 117, 147
4QLev^{g} 55
4QNum^{b} 57–70, 109, 110, 117, 121, 132, 146, 147, 148, 151, 152, 162, *300*
4QDeut^{b} *166*
4QDeut^{c} 148, *166*
4QDeut^{h} 133, 140, 148
4QDeut^{j} 31, *32*, 39, 41, 58, 130, 133, 148, 149, 151, 152, 164, 222, 278
4QDeut^{k1} 33, 37, 39, 41, 151, 164, 278
4QDeut^{k2} 23, 151
4QDeut^{m} 151

4QDeut[n] 29, 32, *32*, 37, 39, 41, 58, 108, 121, 133, 140, 147, 149, 152, 164, *209*, *301*
4QDeut[q] 33, 37, 39, 40, 41, 58, 147, 152, 164, 222
4QpaleoDeut[r] 142
4QpaleoDeut[s] 142
4QJosh[a] 149, 152, 154, 158, 163, 166
4QpaleoParaJosh (4Q123) 88, 142
4QJudg[a] 149, 154, 164, 166, *400*
4QJudg[c] *130*
4QSam[a] 100, *102*, 129, 132, 134, 143, 148, 149, 152, 154, 158, 164, 166, 222, 292, *329*
4QSam[b] 129, 152, 181
4QSam[c] 50, 115, 146, 152
4QKgs 152
4QIsa[a] 43, 54, 109
4QIsa[b] 43, 54, 130
4QIsa[c] 43, 52, 54, 55, *55*, 56, 132, 139, 147, 152
4QIsa[d] 38, 43, 54, 147
4QIsa[e] 43, 54
4QIsa[f] 43, 54
4QIsa[g] 43, 54
4QIsa[h] 43, 54
4QIsa[i] 43, 54
4QIsa[j] 43, 54
4QIsa[k] 43, 54, 152
4QIsa[l] 43, 54
4QIsa[m] 43, 54
4QIsa[n] 43, 54
4QIsa[o] 43, 54
4QpapIsa[p] 43, 54, *131*
4QIsa[q] 43, 54
4QIsa[r] 43, 54
4QJer[a] 132, 139, 152, 168, 181, 201, *201*, *211*, 218, 219
4QJer[b] 29, 100, 111, 130, 139, 147, 152, 154, *156*, 157, 163, 166, 167, 168, *182*, 216, 218, 219
4QJer[c] 12, 124, 139, 152, 181, 218, 219
4QJer[d] 29, 100, 130, 139, 147, 152, 154, *156*, 157, 163, 166, 167, 168, *182*, 216, 218, 219
4QJer[e] 130
4QEzek[a] 37, 38, 40, 152
4QEzek[b] 133, 152, 164
4QXII[a] *166*
4QXII[b] 132, 133
4QXII[d] 132
4QXII[g] 110, 132, 133
4QPs[a] 36, *36*
4QPs[b] 36, 38, 111, 222
4QPs[c] 152
4QPs[d] 36, *36*
4QPs[e] 36, *36*
4QPs[f] 36, 131
4QPs[g] 33, *33*, 37, 40, 133, 165
4QPs[h] 33, *33*, 40, 133, 165
4QPs[k] 36
4QPs[l] 133, 165
4QPs[n] 36, 39, 165
4QPs[q] 36, *36*, *128*
4QPs[x] (4Q98g) 113, 154
4QpaleoJob[c] 142
4QCant[a] 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 58, 149, 153, 164
4QCant[b] 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 51, 58, 149, 153, 164, 224
4QLam 110, 133, 134, 153
4QQoh[a] 45, 109, 129, 134, 153, *166*
4QQoh[b] 130
4QDan[a] 134
4QDan[b] 134
4QDan[c] 134
4QDan[d] 117
4QDan[e] 134, 165
4QEzra 153
4QChr 153

5QDeut 38, 39, *166*
5QKgs 132
5QIsa 43
5QPhyl (5Q8) *30*
5QPs 33, *33*, 40, 133, 165

6QpaleoGen 142
6QpaleoLev 142
6QDeut? 23
6QpapKgs 152, *166*
6QCant 109, 153

8QGen 130

11QpaleoLev[a] 109, 110, 121, 123, 129, 132, 133, 142, 221, 421–7
11QLev[b] 23, 421–7

11QDeut	23, 421–7
11QEzek	152, 421–7
11QPs[a]	*33*, 35, 36, 37, *37*, 41, 58, 123, 131, 132, 152, *153*, 164, 221, 222, 422–7
11QPs[b]	36, 41, 131, 422–7
11QPs[c]	422–7
11QPs[d]	422–7
11QPs[e]	422–7
MurGen-Num	111, 133
MurGen[(a)]	*129*
MurIsa	43, 54, *54*, 132
MurXII	110, 111, 132, *136*, 200, *201*
SdeirGen	112, 132, 133
5/6ḤevPs	152
MasLev[b]	112, *177*
MasDeut	112, 132, 171–88
MasEzek	112, 171–88
MasPs[a]	109, 152, 173
MasPs[b]	37, 112, 132, 152
XLev	*128*
XJosh	*128*, 132, 135
XJudg	*128*, 130, 135
XMinor Prophets	*128*
XBiblical Text?	135

b. Nonbiblical Texts

The texts are arranged by site and cave and within each cave alphabetically with the inventory number provided in parenthesis.

CD 16:2–3	59
1Q13	*30*
1QapGen ar	44, 108, 117, 126, 300
1QDM (1Q22)	83, 84
1QH[a]	*42*, 49, 111, 115, 126, 210
1QM	110, 111, 126, *212*
1QpHab	44, 49, 108, 115, *122*, 123, 137, *137*, 138. 222, 396
1QS	44, 50, 111, 115, 120, 121, *122*, 124, 126, *139*, 174, 210, *212*, *213*
1QSa	50, 115, *122*
1QSb	50, 115, *122*
3QCopper Scroll (3Q15)	123
4Q342–360	343
4QAccount C ar or heb (4Q355)	344
4QAccount gr (4Q350)	186, 341, 343–64
4QapocrJosh[a] (4Q378)	71–91
4QapocrJosh[b] (4Q379)	30, 71–91
4QapocrJosh[c]? (4Q522)	71–91
4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer (4Q448)	110, 115, 122
4QBarkhi Nafshi[b] (4Q435)	123
4QBirth of Noah[a] ar (4Q534)	113
4QCal Doc D (4Q394 1–2)	111
4QCatena A (4Q177)	27
4QCommGen (4Q252–254a)	58
4QD	174
4QD[a] (4Q266)	122
4QDanSuz? ar (4Q551)	113
4QEn[a] ar (4Q201)	113
4QExercitium Calami A (4Q234)	113
4QExercitium Calami B (4Q360)	113
4QExercitium Calami C (4Q341)	113
4QExposition on the Patriarchs (4Q464)	58
4QFlor (4Q174)	27
4QH[c] (4Q429)	210
4QHalakha A (4Q251)	174
4QHodayot-like Text C (4Q440)	110
4QIncantation (4Q444)	110
4QJub[a] (4Q216)	57, 61, 115, *209*
4QList of False Prophets ar (4Q339)	112, 122
4QM[a] (4Q491)	*212*
4QMez A	32, 41
4QMez B	31
4QMez C	31
4QMez G	*129*
4QMidrEschat[a] (4Q174)	27, 38
4QMidrEschat[b] (4Q177)	27, 38
4QMidrEschat[c]? (4Q182)	27
4QMidrEschat[d]? (4Q178)	27
4QMidrEschat[e]? (4Q183)	27
4QMish C (4Q324)	344

4QMMT[a] (4Q394) 111
4QNarrative Work and Prayer (4Q460) 341, 343–64
4QNon-Canonical Psalms A (4Q380) 136
4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381) 136
4QOrd[a] (4Q159) 27, 38
4QOrd[b] (4Q513) 27, 38
4QOrd[c] (4Q514) 27, 38
4QpaleoUnidentified Text 1 (4Q124) 142
4Qpap cryptA Lev[h] (4Q249j) *129*, *131*, *141*
4Qpap paraExod gr (4Q127) 108, 341, 346–64
4Qpap pIsa[c] (4Q163) *131*
4QpapDibHam[b] (4Q505) 27
4QpapDibHam[c] (4Q506) 27
4QpapH[f] (4Q432) 210
4QpapM[f] (4Q496) 27
4QpapPrFêtes[c] (4Q509) 27
4QpapS[a] (4Q255) *213*
4QpapUnclassified frags. (4Q51a) 124, 134
4QpapUnidentified Fragment gr (4Q361) 342
4QParaGen-Exod (4Q422) 84
4QPhyl A *32*, 153
4QPhyl B *32*, 153
4QPhyl G 32, *32*, 41
4QPhyl H *32*
4QPhyl I *32*
4QPhyl J *32*, 153
4QPhyl L *32*
4QPhyl M *32*
4QPhyl N 33
4QPhyl O *32*
4QPhyl S *129*
4QPhyl U *129*
4QpNah (4Q169) 137, 138
4QpPs[a] (4Q171) 137
4QpPs[b] (4Q173) 55, 137
4QprEsth[a] ar (4Q550) 160
4QprEsth[b] ar (4Q550a) 121, 160
4QprEsth[c] ar (4Q550b) 160
4QprEsth[d] ar (4Q550c) 160
4QprEsth[e] ar (4Q550d) 160
4QprEsth[f] ar (4Q550e) 160
4QpsEzek[c] (4Q385b) 109
4QRP 20–26, *59*, 148, 164, 304–5
4QRP[a] (4Q158) 21, *21*, *30*, 61, *67*, *131*, 148, *148*
4QRP[b] (4Q364) 21, *131*, 148, *148*
4QRP[c] (4Q365) 20, *131*, 148, *148*
4QRP[d] (4Q366) 20, *131*, 148
4QRP[e] (4Q367) 20, *131*, 148
4QS[b] (4Q256) *212*, *213*
4QS[d] (4Q258) *212*, *213*
4QS[e] (4Q259) 210, *212*, *213*
4QS[g] (4Q261) *212*, *213*
4Q–11QTemple 304
4QTanḥ (4Q176) 27
4QT[b] (4Q524) *59*
4QTest (4Q175) 27–41, 61, *67*, 75, *90*, 131, *139*, 140, *147*, *165*, 386
4QUnidentified Text gr (4Q126) 341, 346–64
4QWays of Righteousness[b] (4Q421) 121

5QapocrJosh? (5Q9) 71–91

8QPhyl (8Q3) *30*, 32, 41

11QapocrPs (11Q11) 36, 124, 422–7
11QcryptA Unidentified Text (11Q23) 422–7
11QFragment Related to Serekh ha-Yaḥad (11Q29) 422–7
11QHymns[a] 422–7
11QHymns[b] 422–7
11QJub (11Q12) 422–7
11QMelch (11Q13) 27, 38, 422–7
11QNJ ar (11Q18) 422–7
11QpaleoUnidentified Text (11Q22) 142, 422–7
11QSefer ha-Milḥamah (11Q14) 422–7
11QShirShabb (11Q17) 108, 422–7
11QT[a] (11Q19) 10–12, 17–20, 18, *19*, 20, 44, 49, 58, 59, *59*, *67*, 69, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 115, 124, *209*, 300, 422–7
11QT[b] (11Q20) 23, *59*, 422–7

11QT[c]? (11Q21) 422–7
11QUnidentified Text ar (11Q24) 422–7
11QUnidentified Text A (11Q25) 422–7
11QUnidentified Text B (11Q26) 422–7
11QUnidentified Text C (11Q27) 422–7
11QpapUnidentified Text D (11Q27) 422–7
11QUnclassified Frags. (11Q30) 422–7
11QUnidentified wads (11Q31) 422–7
XQText A 422–7
XQText B 422–7
KhQ 2393 122
KhQ ostr. 3 *113*
Mur 1 125, 130, 132
Mur 10B 11, *113*
Mur 73 78–80, *113*
Mas ostraca 606 608, 113
Mas pap paleoText of Sam. Origin (Mas 1o recto) 142
Mas pap paleoUnidentified Text (Mas 1o verso) 142
Mas papLiterary Text? gr (Mas 739) 341–64
MasShirShabb (Mas 1k) 112
MasSir 109, 112
Mas woodTablet gr (Mas 743) 341–64

3. Ancient Biblical Translations

Greek

4QLXXLev[a] (4Q119) 186, 341, 344–64
4QpapLXXLev[b] (4Q120) 108, 186, 204, 341, 345–64
4QLXXNum (4Q121) 341, 345–64
4QLXXDeut (4Q122) 341, 346–64
7Q1–19 341
7QpapLXXExod (7Q1) 346–64
7QpapEpJer gr (7Q2) 341, 346–64
7QpapBiblical Texts? gr (7Q3–5) 347–64
7Q4–18 341
7QpapUnclassified Texts gr (7Q6–19) 347–64
8ḤevXIIgr 111, 112, *186*, 187, 341–64
P.Chester Beatty (967) (Ezekiel) 157
P.Fouad *185*
P.Oxy. 7.1007 (Genesis 2–3) *186*, 187
P.Oxy. 50.3522 (Job 42) *186*
P.Rylands Greek 458 (Deuteronomy) *185*, 187
P.Vindob. Gr 39777 (Psalms) *186*

LXX

Genesis 158
Gen 5 158
Gen 8 158
Gen 11 158
Gen 30:43 320
Gen 47:21 318
Exod 5:7 390
Exod 12:16 *282*
Exod 23:16 390
Exod 35–40 161
Lev 3:11 356
Lev 3:12 356
Lev 4:7 357
Lev 4:10 357
Lev 4:18 357
Lev 4:27 350, 358
Lev 5:21 358
Lev 23:39 390
Lev 26:4 351, 352
Lev 26:5 350
Lev 26:6 350, 353
Lev 26:8 350, 351
Lev 26:9 351
Lev 26:10 351

Lev 26:11 350, 353
Lev 26:12 352, 353
Lev 26:13 350, 352
Lev 26:14 352
Lev 26:15 351, 352
Lev 26:16 351
Num 3:40 359
Num 3:43 360
Num 4:6–12 359
Num 4:7 358, 360
Num 4:9 360
Num 4:14 360
Deut 4:34 382
Deut 6:4 160
Deut 10:18 272
Deut 11:1 319
Deut 11:25 *382*
Deut 11:31 *281*
Deut 12:1 *281*
Deut 16:8 *282*
Deut 26:8 382
Deut 28:5 380
Deut 28:17 380
Deut 31:27 388
Deut 32:43 160
Deut 33:8 319
Joshua 158
Josh 7:7 317
Josh 9:27 405
Josh 24 *158*
Josh 24:4 405
1–4 Kingdoms 329
1 Kgdms 9:25 319
1 Kgdms 13:3 318
1 Kgdms 16–18 158
1 Kgdms 17:8 319
1 Kgdms 20:30 319
1 Kgdms 20:34 387
1 Kgdms 25:7 387
1 Kgdms 25:15 387
2 Kgdms 6:1 390
2 Kgdms 22:32 318
3–4 Kingdoms 159
3 Kingdoms 285–305
3 Kingdoms 2 299
3 Kgdms 2:35a–o 294
3 Kgdms 2:46a–l 294
3 Kgdms 4:23 384
3 Kgdms 5:1 288
3 Kgdms 5:3 384
3 Kgdms 5:14a 288
3 Kgdms 6:1a–d 289
3 Kgdms 6:7 319
3 Kgdms 8:53a 289
3 Kgdms 10:22a–c 289
3 Kgdms 12:24a–z 288, 294, 407
4 Kgdms 17:20 318
Isaiah 42–56
Isa 1:24 389
Isa 3:6 388
Isa 11:11 392
Isa 13:15 390
Isa 23:17 (16) 319
Isa 29:1 389
Isa 50:2 384, 396
Isa 63:14 389
Jeremiah 57, 410–14
Jer 2:25 383
Jer 3:6 393
Jer 3:8 393
Jer 3:12 393
Jer 4:16 392
Jer 6:11 387
Jer 7:21 389
Jer 8:2 385
Jer 8:5 393
Jer 8:13 391
Jer 9:13 394
Jer 15:11 394
Jer 17:17 386
Jer 18:12 384
Jer 18:21 384
Jer 19:3 413
Jer 20:10 385
Jer 23:1 259, 391
Jer 23:2 259
Jer 23:31 389
Jer 31(38):5 318
Jer 32 (39):21 382
Jer 46(26):27 394
Jer 49(30):2 393
Jer 51(28):20 391
Ezek 2:3 388
Ezek 7:3–9 157
Ezek 12:26–28 157
Ezek 23:32 387
Ezek 29:14 393
Ezek 32:25–26 157
Ezek 34:21 391
Hos 10:2 394
Joel 2:11 382
Joel 4:16 386
Mic 1:12 385
Hab 1:7 382
Hab 1:8–17 361–2
Hab 2:1–3 361–2

Hab 3:17 387
Zeph 1:2 391
Mal 3:11 318
Ps 2:9 392
Ps 9:26 385
Ps 9:28 388
Ps 10:5 385
Ps 10:7 388
Ps 151 161
Proverbs 161
Prov 7:16 319
Prov 24:12 392
Esther 160, 292–305
Expansions A–E 293–305
Expansion F 185, 293–305
Daniel 4–6 160, 161, 297–305
Dan 4:17a 303
Dan 4:33a–b 303
Dan 4:37a–c 303
Daniel 5 299
Nehemiah 11 158
1–2 Chronicles 159
2 Chr 30:22 387

Targumim

4QtgJob 343
4QtgLev 343
11QtgJob 109, 121, 123, 132, 343, 422–7

4. Rabbinic and Medieval Jewish Literature

m. Kil. 9.3 122
m. Yom. 1.6 178
7.1 121
m. Meg. 1.8 *185*
2.1 *185*
2.2 127
m. Moʿed Qat. 3.4 *178*, 180
m. Soṭ. 7.7 121
m. Kel. 15.6 *178*
28.4 122
m. Yad. 4.5 142

b. Shabb. 75b 109
103a–105a 117
103b *200*
115a 371
b. ʿErub. 26a 203
b. Pes. 112a 135, 167, 180, *182*
b. Yoma 21b *203*
38b *203*
69a–b *178*
b. Meg. 9a 142, 368, 371, 374
18a 371
18b 108, 109
b. Ketub. 19b 180
106a 179
b. Soṭ. 33b *187*, *377*
b. B. Bat. 13b–14b 117
13b 125, 133
14a 38
14b–15a 142
14b *178*
b. Sanh. 4a 182
21b 142
90b *377*
b. Menaḥ. 29b–32b 116
30a 112
31b 121
32b 108
34a–37b 42b–43b, 30
89b *203*
93b 182

y. Taʿan. 4.68a *178*, *204*
y. Meg. 1.71b–72a 117
1.71b–c *142*
1.71c 187, 370, 373
1.71d 107, 109, 121, 122, 127, 135
3.73d *174*, 185
5.4 (73b) 373
y. Moʿed Qat.
3.7 (83b) *373*
y. Ketub. 2.26b *180*
y. Soṭ. 7.23c *187*
y. Sanh. 2.20c *178*, *180*

t. Meg. 2.17 185
4.13 *185*
t. Sanh. 4.7 *180*
5.7 *142*

Sof. 1.1 109, 117, 121, 126, 134
1.7 187, 366, 367, *374*

1.8 107, 368
1.15 134
2.3 135
2.5 135
2.20 135
3.4 125
3.7 *200*
3.9 135
3.10 135
6.4 *178*

Abot R. Nat. 46 *178*

Gen. Rab. 1:14 *376*
46:1 *373*

Mek. Shirata 6
Exod 15:7 *377*

Sifre Numbers § 84 *377*

Sifre Deuteronomy
§ 36 *200*
§ 148 *376*
§ 160 180, *206*

Midrash Tanḥuma Beshallaḥ
Exod 15:7 377

Tanḥ. Buber Bereshit
4 *376*

Yal. Shim. Gen 3 *374*

Massekhet Sefer Torah
1.4 107
2.4 112

Massekhet Tefillin 9 30

Megillat Taʿanit
Batra 366

Midrash Qere we-la
Ketiv *203*

5. Other Sources

Classical Literature

P.Hibeh 7 *39*
P.Petrie I *30*, *39*
P.Rylands Greek 260 *39*
P.Tebt. I *30*, *39*

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Sir 0:15–24 *325*
46:1 *82*
47:12 76
Bar 1:1–3:8 161
1 Esdras 159
2 Macc 2:13–15 *179*
4 Macc 18:10–18 185
Prayer Azariah 303
Epistle of Aristeas *374*
§ 176 168, 175
§ 310–11 367

Jubilees 58, 59, 304

1 Enoch 98:11 348
100 348
103 348
103:3–4 348
105 348
Assumptio Moses 71

New Testament

Luke 4:16–21 133, 174
4:17 121
4:20 121
Acts 6:9 185
15:21 174
17:1 174
17:10–11 *174*

Josephus

Ant. 58
III:38 *178*, *179*
IV:302–304 *178*
IV:303 *179*
V:16–19 163
V:61 *178*, *179*
XII:1–118 *374*

XII:45–115 326
184–296 294
Bell. Jud. VII:150 179
VII:162 162

Additional Sources

Philo, *Hypoth.* 7:13 *185*
Vita Mos. 2:215 *185*
2.12–52 *374*

Ps.-Philo 58

Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* *377*

Jerome, *Epistle to Pammachius* *326*

Justinian, *Novella* 146 *187*

Theodotos Inscription 185

Severus Scroll 47, 51

JB 92–106
JPS 92–106
KJV 92–106
NAB 92–106
NEB 92–106
NIV 92–106
NRSV 92–106
REB 92–106
RSV 92–106

Authors

Aalders, G.C. *95*
Abegg, M.G. *46*, *49*, *226*, 227, *300*
Abercrombie, J.R. 321
Adair, J. *232*
Adler, W. 321
Aejmelaeus, A. *284*
Aland, K. 95, 110, 243, 347, 348
Albertz, R. *160*, *297*, *299*
Albrektson, B. 95, 97, 98, *100*, *102*
Albright, W.F. *92*, *188*
Alexander, P.S. 212, *213*, 333, *334*, *335*
Allegro, J.M. *21*, *386*
Allen, L.C. *159*
Amir, D. 86
Andersen, F.I. *4*, 11, 230, 231
Aptowitzer, V. *368*
Arndt, W.F. 246
Artom, E.S. *33*
Ashton, J. *107*
Athias, J. *251*
Auld, A.G. *404*
Aungier, A. 311, 323

Bader, W. *230*
Baer, S. 11, 251
Baillet, M. *23*, *27*, *30*, *69*, *212*, 346, 347
Barag, D. *171*
Barber, E.A. *380*
Bardtke, H. 51
Bar-Ilan, M. 107
Barnes, W.E. *377*
Barr, J. 1–16, *100*, 104, *204*, 203, *226*, 327, 328, 331, *335*, *378*, *379*, *380*
Barthélemy, D. *44*, *46*, 49, 52, 53, 54, *95*, *104*, *136*, *155*, *169*, 187, 190, *283*, *290*, *291*, *329*, *336*, 349, 369, 370, 371
Baruch, Y. *130*
Bauer, W. 9, 246
Baumgärtel, F. *329*
Baumgarten, J.M. *174*, 234
Baumgartner, W. 244
Becker, J. *269*
Beckwith, R. *178*
Beentjes, P.C. 237
Begrich, J. *92*
Ben-Dov, J. *111*
Ben-Hayyim, Z. *47*
Benoit, P. 347, 348
Bernstein, M.J. *49*, *58*, 290, *300*
Berrin, S.L. *370*
Bickerman, E.J. 283, *295*, *303*, 330, *331*
Biel, J.C. 314, 316–318, 321
Binder, D.D. *171*, *184*, *192*, *206*
Bindseil, H.E. *11*, 310, 311, 313, 321, 322
Birken, S. *310*
Birt, T. *27*, 37, 292
Blau, L. *179*, *180*
Blau, Y. 379, *397*
Bogaert, P.-M. *33*, *155*, *157*, *162*, *416*
Böhler, D. *158*, 159, 169
Bonani, G. *44*
Bootius, A. 311
Borbone, P.G. *93*, 224, *254*, 264
Bos, L. 312
Botta, A. *330*
Botterweck, G.J. *397*
Bowley, J.E. *227*
Breuer, M. 203, *248*, *249*, 253, 270
Brin, G. 20, 69
Brock, S.P. *94*, *325*, 330, 331, *332*, *336*
Brockington, L.H. *98*, *102*
Brooke, A.E. 316
Brooke, G.J. 28, 33, 37, *128*, *137*, *138*, *145*, *146*, *153*, *154*, 233, 238, *300*, *304*
Broshi, M. 38, *44*, 117, *118*, 122, *130*, 134
Brown, R. *232*
Brownlee, W.H. *46*, *47*,*49*, *137*, 138, *294*
Budde, K. *92*
Burkitt, F.C. *356*
Burney, C.F. *406*
Burrows, M. *44*, 45, *46*, *50*, *51*, *118*, *221*
Buxtorf, J. *251*, 311

Caird, G.B. *380*
Callaway, P.R. 20
Calvesmaki, J. *232*

Campbell, A.F. *398*
Campbell, J.G. *58*, *137*
Carmi, I. *44*
Carmignac, J. *136*
Carswell, J. *122*, 138, *141*
Cassuto, M.D. 251, 269, *287*
Catastini, A. *254*, *416*
Ceriani, A.M. 241
Chadwick, H. *27*, *39*
Chamberlain, J.V. *48*
Charlesworth, J.H. *156*, *212*
Clark, D.J. *94*
Clark, K.W. *118*
Clines, D.J.A. *160*, *292*, *295*
Cohen, M. 12, *53*, *204*, *250*, *252*
Cohen, M.B. 248, *251*
Collin, M. *138*
Collins, J. *110*, *297*, *298*, *299*, *303*
Conybeare, F.C. 233, 239
Cook, E.M. *227*
Cook, J. *47*, *49*, *284*
Cook, R.R.E. 347, 348
Cooke, G.A. 169, *417*
Cornill, C.H. *92*
Cotton, H. *340*, *341*, 343, 344
Crim, K.R. *100*
Cross, F.M., Jr. 3, 8, *44*, 45, *46*, *92*, 108, *117*, *145*, *147*, 148, *164*, *164*, 171, *227*, *399*
Crowfoot, G.M. 122, 126, *139*
Crown, A. 237
Cryer, F.H. *145*

Dahmen, U. *36*, 55, *130*
Dahood, M.J. 267
Daley, S. *96*
Danker, W.D. 246
Davila, J.R. 129, 150, 170, *224*
de Lagarde, P.A. 316, 363
de Montfaucon, B. 312
de Pury, A. *399*, *402*
de Rossi, G.B. 261
de Troyer, K. *160*, *164*
de Vaux, R. *113*, 117, *118*, 342
de Waard, J. *136*, 190
Debus, J. 287, 407, 408
Delitzsch, F. 251
den Hartog, C.G. *401*
Dexinger, F. *163*
Dietrich, W. *415*
Dimant, D. 74, *88*, 90, 346, 424, *425*, *431*
Dirksen, P.D. 195
Dogniez *94*, *349*
Donahue, D.J. *44*
Dorival, G. *184*, 187
Dorothy, C.V. *292*
Dos Santos, E.C. 315, 320, 322
Dotan, A. 4, 11, 191, *204*, *247*, *249*, 252, 253, 270
Doudna, G. *212*
Driver, G.R. *378*, *397*
Driver, S.R. 267, 402
Duhaime, J. *212*
Duncan, J.A. 31, *32*, 33, 37, 130, *140*, *430*

Eisenman, R.H. 73, 79
Eissfeldt, O. *213*
Elgvin, T. *130*
Elliger, K. *138*, *157*
Elwolde, J. *137*
Eshel, E. 32, 38, *41*, *60*, *113*, *130*, *147*, *213*
Eshel, H. *74*, 90, *91*, *130*, *213*, *422*
Etheridge, J.W. 241
Ewald, H. *399*
Eynikel, E. 245

Fassberg, S.E. *204*
Fee, G. 348
Fernández Marcos, N. *164*
Field, F. 233, 238, 316
Filipowskius, H. *397*
Finkelstein, L. *202*, *206*
Fischer, J. *329*
Fishbane, M. *174*
Fitzmyer, J.A. *101*, 195, *348*
Flashar, M. *388*
Flint, P.W. *36*, 37, *42*, 43, *44*, *128*, *135*, *146*, *151*, 153, *154*, *221*, *226*
Forbes, A.D. *4*, 11, 229–231
Fox, M.V. *160*, *264*, *284*
Frankel, Z. *185*, *368*, *378*, *379*
Freedman, D.B. *248*, *251*
Freedman, D.N. 3, 8, *92*, 129, *221*, 245, *421*
Frenschkowski, M. *214*
Frey, J.B. *185*
Friedländer, M. *366*
Friedman, M.A. *178*
Fürst, J. *368*

Gagnier, J. 311, 313, 322, 323
Gallo, I. 344
Gamble, H.Y. *292*
Garbini, G. 53, *254*
García Martínez, F. 24, *42*, *43*, *46*, *58*, 79, *128*, *152*, *213*, 421–423
Gard, D.H. *161*
Garnet, P. 348

Geiger, A. *340*, *341*
Gelston, A. *93*
Gerleman, G. *161*, *328*, *337*
Gesenius, W. *396*, *397*
Giese, R.L. *47*, 49
Giesebrecht, F. *92*
Gingrich, F.W. 246
Ginsberg, H.L. *105*
Ginsberg, L. *82*, *368*
Ginsburg, C.D. *202*, *247*, *248*, *249*, 251, 252, 269
Glare, P.G.W. 245, *380*
Glatzer, M. *252*
Golb, N. 114, 143
Goldberg, I. *137*
Goldman, Y.A.P. 190, *414*
González, A. *46*
Goodblatt, D. *177*
Gooding, D.W. *175*, 286, *283*, *284*, 287, *289*, 290, *332*, 338, *368*, *406*
Goranson, S. *117*, 118, *134*
Gordis, R. *179*, *201–204*
Gordon, R.P. 98
Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. *36*, 46, *47*, *136*, *223*, *249*, 250, *251*, *252*, *253*, 256, 261, 270, *372*
Göttsburger, J. 322
Grabbe, L.L. *371*
Gray, J. *287*, 406
Greenberg, M. *156*, 177
Greenspoon, L.J. 98, 339, 371
Greenstein, E.L. *136*
Greetham, D.C. *268*
Gregory, C.R. 309, 313, 322
Grelot, R. *160*, *298*, *299*
Grether, H.G. *103*
Grossfeld, B. *297*
Groves, A. *232*, 234
Gruenwald, I. *374*
Gunkel, H. 267

Habel, N.C. *155*
Hahn, A. *251*
Hahne, H. 235, *260*
Halma, F. 312
Hammershaimb, E. *51*, *118*
Haneman, G. *396*
Hanhart, R. *103*, *160*, *294*, 322
Hanson, P.D. *93*
Hanson, R.S. *142*
Haran, M. 36, *113*, *178*, 207, *219*
Harl, M. *187*
Harrington, D.J. *289*, *300*
Hatch, E. 12, 309, 314, 315
Hatton, H.A. *94*
Haupt, P. *92*, 215
Hauspie, K. 245
Helbing, R. *388*
Helledius, A. 313
Heller, Ch. *397*
Hendel, R. 224, 247, *254*, 255, 263, 264, 266, 281, 299
Hengel, M. 185
Herrmann, J. *329*
Higger, M. 30, *376*
Hodius, H. *337*
Høgenhaven, J. *46*, *48*, *137*
Hognesius, K. *254*, 264
Hollenberg, J. *401*
Holmes, S. 74, 314–316, *404*, *405*, *410*
Hort, F.J.A. 95, 110
Hughes, J.J. *232*
Hulst, A.R. 190
Hurowitz, V.A. *407*
Huwyler, B. *214*
Hyatt, J.P. *413*

Irwin, W.A. *96*
Ivy, S. *44*

Jablonski, D.E. *251*
Jacques, X. 317, 320, 322
James, F.D. *46*
Jarick, J. 321, 322
Jastram, N. 121, *147*
Jeansonne, S.P. *160*, *298*
Jellicoe, S. *293*, 315, 321
Jellinek, A. *203*
Jobes, K.H. *160*, *180*
Joosten, J. *379*
Jull, A.J.T. *44*

Kahle, P. *138*, 344, 345, *363*
Kaiser, O. *416*
Kaufman, S.A. 20
Kautzsch, E. *396*, *397*
Kenney, E.J. *264*
Kennicott, B. *108*, 261
Kim, A. *148*
Kim, D.-H. *145*
Kim, H. *337*
Kim, K.-R. 231, *271*
Kircher, C. 310–316, 322, 323
Kister, M. *178*
Kittel, G. 245
Kittel, R. *210*, *249*

Klijn, A.F.J. *179*
Knobloch, F.W. 231
Knoppers, G.N. *158*, *398*
Knox, R.A. *94*
Koenig, J. *46*, 49
Kogut, S. *372*, *404*
Köhler, L. 234, 244
Koren, M. *251*, 270
Kraft, R.A. *231–233*, 238, *314*, 321, 322, 349
Krauss, S. *177*, *179*
Krispenz, J. 229, *256*
Kuhl, C. *46*, *47*, *49*
Kuhn, K.G. *30*
Kutscher, Y. *45–47*, 51, *178*, *179*, *201*, *384*, 389, 390, *397*

Lamsa, G.M. *94*
Lancashire, I. *232*
Lange, A. 38, *59*, *130*, *137*, 433–436
Langen, J. 293
Lansing Hicks, R. *206*
Larson, E. 343, 344
Lauterbach, J.Z. *178*
Le Long, J. 311, 313, 322
Le Mat, L.A.F. *93*
Leander, P. 9
Leaney 339, *363*
Lebram, J.C.H. *367*
Leiman, S.Z. *366*
Leipoldt, J. *178*
Lemaire, A. *113*, *146*, *181*, *207*
Leroy, J. *108*
Letteris, M.H. 215, *248*, *249*, *251*, 269
Leusden, J. *251*
Leveen, J. *46*
Levenson, J.D. *295*
Levin, S. 203
Levine, B. 267
Levine, L.I. *171*, 174, *184*
Lewis, N. *340*
Lieberman, S. 125, *177*, *178*, *180*, 181, 182
Lifschitz, B. *185*
Lim, T.H. *90*, 138, *146*, 156
Ljungberg, B. *100*
Locher, C. 95
Loewinger, D.S. 52, *252*
Lohfink, R. *214*, *218*, *219*, 190
Lübbe, J. *145*
Lust, J. *155*, 157, *158*, 169, 231, 232, 245, *273*, *283*, *299*, 323

Manfredi, M. *344*
Mangenot, E. 322
Mann, J. *174*
Mansoor, M. *47*, *136*
Maori, Y. *47*, 51, *328*, *370*
Margolis, M.L. 323, 316, 317, *319*, 320
Marquis, G. 231, 232, 241, 242, 321, 323
Martin, M. 18, *45*, *46*, *47*, *49*, 54, 115, 124
Martin, R.A. 293, 323
Mathews, K.A. 129, *142*, *221*, *421*
Mathijsen, M. *268*
Mazar, B. *93*
Mazor, L. *79*, 80, *158*, *164*, *178*, *401*, *402*, *410*
McCarthy, C. *377*
McConville, J.G. *398*
McHardy, W.D. 190
McKane, W. 95, *413*
McKenzie, S.L. *398*, 408, 409
McLean, M.D. *142*, 233, 238, 316
Meinhold, J. *92*
Melamed, E.Z. *372*
Menken, M.J.J. *365*
Mercati, G. *356*
Metso, S. *137*, *212*, 344, *354*
Metzger, B.M. *40*, *95*, *118*
Meyer, R. *33*
Meyers, E.M. *175*, *195*
Michaelis, J.D. 251
Milgrom, J. 267
Milik, J.T. *30*, *33*, *44*, 55, 75, 86, 89, 113, *129*, *135*, 160, *221*, 425
Min, Y.J. *411*
Mittmann-Richert, U. 433–436
Moffatt, J. 95, 110
Molin, G. *137*
Montgomery, J.A. *297*, *298*
Moore, C.A. *293–295*, *303*
Morenz, S. *178*, *337*
Morgenstern, M. *30*, *135*, *221*
Morrish, G. 314, 323
Morrow, F.J. *46*, *54*
Moscati, S. *397*
Moscovitz, L. *372*
Mowinckel, S. *411*
Muilenburg, J. *43*, *45*
Müller, D.H. *92*
Müller, M. *103*, *104*, *119*
Mundhenk, N. *94*
Munnich, O. *157*, *160*, *297*
Muraoka, T. *286*, *291*, 315, 320, 323
Muro, E.A., Jr. 33, 347, 348
Murphy, C. 135, *221*
Mutzenbecher, E.H. 16, 314

Nakman, D. *140*
Naor, M. *93*
Nebe, G.W. *113*, 347, 348
Nelson, R.D. *400*
Nestle, E. 95, 243
Netzer, E. *114*, 172
Neubauer, A. *366*
Newsom, C. *30*, 71, 72, 84, 85, 89
Nicholson, E. *413*
Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 347, 348
Nida, E.A. 96
Nieuwoudt, B.A. 231
Nir-El, Y. 117, 134
Nitzan, B. *213*
Nöldeke, Th. *292*
Norton, G.J. 190
Noss, Ph.A. *94*
Noth, M. *47*, *49*, *218*, *267*
Novakovic, L. *137*

O'Brien, M.A. *398*
O'Callaghan, J. 347, 348
Oesch, J.M. 51
Offer, J. *252*
Olmstead, A.T. *416*
Omanson, R.L. *94*
Orlinsky, H.M. *44*, *51*, *118*, *136*, *161*, *202*, *329*, *416*

Parker, P. 348
Parry, D.W. *44*, 45, *46*, 129, 221, 223, *430*
Parsons, P.J. 314–316, 345, 346
Paton, L.B. *295*
Paul, S.M. *398*
Payne, D.F. 98, *100*
Payne, P. *232*
Pedley, K.G. *118*
Penkower, J.S. *247*, *248*, *250*, 252
Penna, A. *47*
Perrot, C. 174
Person, R.F. 71, *398*, *399*, *413*, *414*, 415, 416
Peterca, V. *289*
Peters, N. *92*, *155*
Pfann, S.J. *72*, 118, *131*, *140*, *141*, *340*, 425, *428*, *430*
Pickering, S.R. 347, 348
Pietersma, A. *294*, 334, 357
Pietsch, M. *287*
Pisano, S. 190
Pohlmann, K.F. 159
Polak, F.H. 229–232, 242, 286, 321, 323, *328*, *387*
Porten, B. *330*, *344*
Premstaller, V. 229
Prijs, L. *368*, *397*
Puech, É. 73–78, 81, 82, 85, 89, 113, *128–130*, 347–349, 430
Pulikottil, P. *46*, *49*, *146*

Qimron, E. *44*, 45, 73–82, 129, *221*, *223*

Rabin, C. 106, *223*, *247*, *252*, 270, 330, *331*, *368*, *392*
Radday, Y.T. 229
Rahlfs, A. 9, 13, 16, 32, 195, 208, 238, 241, 260, *294*, 316, 329, 344–346, 350
Rapallo, U. *380*
Redpath, H.A. 12, 18, 310–321, 323
Reich, R. *113*
Reider, J. 187, 318, 323, *373*
Renz, J. *113*
Richards, K.H. *47*, *49*
Riska, M. *137*
Roberts, B.J. 53
Roberts, C.H. *39*, 345, 347, 348,
Rofé, A. *153*, *158*, *163*, 164, *169*, *283*, *404*, *405*, *410*, *417*
Rohrhirsch, F. *114*
Röllig, W. *113*
Römer, T. *399*, *402*, *410*
Rosenbloom, J.R. *46*
Rosenerch 323
Rosenmüller, E.F.K.[C.] *251*, 323
Rothstein, D. *30*, *140*
Rouse, M.A. 309, 323
Rouse, R.H. 309, 323
Ruben, P. *92*
Rubinstein, A. *46*, *48*, *51*, 55
Rüger, H.P. 95, *101*, 190

Sadaqa, A. and R. *62*, 70
Saenz Badillos, A. *397*
Safrai, S. 174, 180, *368*
Saley, R.J. *148*
Sanders, H.A. 237
Sanders, J.A. *35–37*, *42*, *43*, *104*, 153, 190, *255*, *422*
Sanderson, J.E. 33, 38, 133, *165*, *204*, 344–346
Savile, H. 310, 311, 313, 323
Scanlin, H.P. 95, 102, *104*, *105*
Schäfer, P. *269*
Schearing, L.S. *398*
Schenker, A. 77, *96*, *100*, 159, *169*, 189, 190, 260, 286, 287, *288*, 408

Schiffman, L.H. *146*, 174, *423*
Schleusner, J.F. 17, 314–318, 324
Schmidt, H. *214*
Scholz, A. *293*
Schorch, S. *377*
Schürer, E. *185*
Schwarz, J. *337*
Schwarz, O.J.R. *42*
Schweizer, H. *230*
Scorza, S. 18
Seeligmann, I.L. 54, *329*, *334*
Segal, M. *30*, *300*, 301, *305*
Segal, M.H. *396*
Segert, S. *138*
Seybold, K. *214*
Shamosh, A. *252*
Shinan, A. *335*
Shore, H. *229*
Siegel, J.P. *47*, 51, *184*
Silverstone, A.E. *373*
Simotas, N. 324
Sinclair, L.A. *138*
Sixtus Senensis 309
Skehan, P.W. *33*, 36, *38*, *42*, *43*, *45*, *49*, *54*, *56*, 113, *128*, *140*, *142*, *154*, *204*, 344, 345, 346, *350*, *354*, 357, 359–361, *363*
Smend, R. *169*, 316, 324, *398*, *399*
Smith, M. *386*
Snaith, N.H. *247*, *249*, 251, 270
Sollamo, R. *96*, *401*
Sonne, I. *174*
Sparks, H.F.D. *328*
Sperber, A. 240, *253*, *395*, *396*
Spottorno, M.V. 347
Stahl, R. *155*
Stamm, J.J. 244
Steck, O.H. *47*
Steckoll, S.H. 118
Stegemann, H. 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 38, 40, 114, *356*, 357, *427*, *429–431*
Steudel, A. *27*, *28*, 73
Steuernagel, C. 216, *218*, *219*
Stipp, H.-J. *155*, *414*
Stock, St. G. 233, 239
Strugnell, J. *21*, 23, *33*, *44*, *343*
Sugdures, G. 313
Sukenik, E.L. *44*, 52, 53, 129, *221*, 400, 411–414
Sundberg, A. *295*, *303*
Swete, H.B. 26, *157*, 233, 238, 239, *253*, 316, 321, 324
Sysling, H. *372*

Tal, A. *25*, *62*, *63*, 233, 237, *334*, *369*
Talmon, S. 36, *37*, 43, 48, *55*, 87, 89, *111*, *135*, *142*, *173*, *177*, *178*, *182*, *221*, *223*, *252*, 270, *422*
Talshir, Z. *155*, *283*, 287, *289*, *299*, 407–409
Taylor, B. 235
Taylor, C. *356*
Teicher, J.L. *46*
Thackeray, H.St.J. 233, 239, 290, *291*, 316, *328*, 329, *337*, *367*
Thenius, O. *155*
Thiede, C.P. 172, 347
Thiel, W. *413*
Thomas, D.W. *379*
Thompson, T.L. *145*
Tigay, J.H. 60, *272*, *275*, *301*
Tigchelaar, E.J.C. *137*, *421*, 423
Toeg, A. *319*
Torrey, C.C. *92*
Tov, E. *21*, *23*, *34*, *44*, *46*, *49*, *53*, *56*, *57*, *59*, *72*, *105*, *135*, *139*, *140*, *147*, *148*, *152*, *163*, *164*, *173*, *202*, *223*, *227*, *228*, 231, *252*, 270, *283*, *284*, *286*, *287*, *291*, *295*, *300*, *304*, *305*, 313, 317, *318*, *320*, 321, 324, *328*, *329*, *335*, *340*, *349*, *368*, *371*, *376*, *378*, *379*, *388*, *395*, *402*, *404*, *405*, *414*, *428*, *430*
Treat, J. *231*
Trebolle Barrera, J.C. *76*, *155*, *157*, *162*, *164*, 408
Trever, J.C. *44*, 124
Trommius, A. 12, 14, 319–317, 323, 324
Turner, E.G. *108*, *207*
Turner, N. *318*, 323
Turner, P.D.M. *329*

Ulrich, E.C. *33*, *43*, *44*, *50*, *96*, *128*, *129*, *134*, *135*, *141*, *142*, *143*, *146*, *154*, *155*, *156*, *160*, *163*, *165*, 183, *204*, 226, 227, *298*, *305*, 344–347, 339, *350*, *354*, 361
Urbán, A.C. 347

van der Hooght, E. 215, *251*
van der Horst, P.W. *185*
van der Kooij, A. *47*, 48, *49*, *146*, *149*, 190, *330*, 334, *338*
van der Meer, M.N. *163*, *402*
van der Ploeg, J.P.M. *23*, 24, *138*
van der Woude, A. *23*, 24, *44*, *128*, *181*, *421*, 423
van Keulen, P.S.F. 285, 286, *289*, 290, 333, *407*

Van Rooy, H.F. *263*
VanderKam, J.C. *59*, *69*, *139*, *304*
Vattioni, F. *268*
Veltri, G. 187, *365*, *366*, *367*, *370*, 371, 373
Vermes, G. *137*, *139*, 212, *213*
Vogelius, F.M. 311
von Baudissin, W.W. *356*
von Gall, A.F. *62*, *63*, 70, 237
von Rad, G. *71*, *409*
von Soden, H. 95
von Tischendorf, C. 237

Wacholder, B.Z. 36, *300*
Walters, P. *350*, *388*
Weber, R. 240
Webster, B. *166*
Wechel, A. 312
Weil, G.E. 191, *229*, 230
Weinfeld, M. 32, 38, 400, 402, 403, *405*, 406, 407, *408*, *409*, 411–413, *414–416*
Weis, R.D. 190, *193*, 256, 258, 259, *266*
Weissert, D. 386, *395*
Weitzman, M.P. *328*, *333*
Wellhausen, J. *155*, 169, *218*, *417*
Wendland, P. *367*
Wenthe, D.O. *160*, *298*
Wernberg-Møller, P. *42*, *46*
West, M.L. *254*
Westcott, B.T. 95, 110
Wevers, J.W. 37, 287, 345, *349*, 350, *354*, *359*, 360,
Wheeler, D. 234, 235
White Crawford, S. *21*, 32, *33*, 38, *152*, *160*, *263*, *304*
Whybray, R.N. *214*
Wifstrand, A. *353*
Williams, J. 313
Wilson, G.H. 36, 37, 43, 153
Wise, M.O. *69*, 73, *79*
Wölfli, W. *44*
Wright, B.G. III 231, 241, *294*, *325*, 330, 331, 336
Würthwein, E. *415*
Wutz, F.X. *92*

Yadin, Y. 19, 20, 30, 87, *124*, *129*, 172, *212*, *421*
Yardeni, A. 122, *340*, 343, *344*, *349*, *428*
Yeivin, I. *201*
Yellin, Y.Y. *182*
Young, I. *135*, *143*, *150*, *176*

Zakovitch, Y. *55*
Zeitlin, S. *178*
Ziegler, J. *47*, *54*, *161*, *226*, *329*, *337*, *349*
Zipor, M.A. *297*, *377*